TO THE

RIGHT HONORABLE,

THE

Lords and Commons

ASSEMBLED in

PARLIAMENT

IT *is far from our thoughts to oppose, or disparage Orthodox* Doctrine, *a well-composed* Liturgy, Rites *for decency and order,* Ordination *of Ministers, Apostolical* Episcopacie, *or due* Rules of Discipline. *We are for all these, with Truth; and, against rigid Impositions which may debar a Christian of any liberty allowed him by Christ.*

Nor do we offer any Polemical Discourse, or Theological Debates proper for a Divinity-School, or Synod: but onely, what we humbly conceive more suitable to a Parliament. Our work, chiefly, is, out of those Laws, which we, as Ministers, are bound to take special notice of; and, out of those Books *said to be by these Laws settled; to make out these two things. First, that (so far as we can ap-*

prehend) neither the Articles of Religion, the Books of Com. Prayer, or Ordination, the Jurisdiction of Bishops, claimed before 17 Car. 1. nor so much as their Being, as Bishops, sithence; nor those Canons so much contended for, are indeed established by Law. Secondly, that none of these, as they now stand, ought to be confirmed and setled. But, all, with submission.

And this we trust shall not be censured as Eccentrick. For, albeit we acknowledge the learned in the Law to be far more able in matter of Law, touching these things; yet, seeing every Subject is to inform himself of all such Laws as more especially concern his own Calling, we hope it will not be judged an extravagancie, or presumption in us, to produce those Laws which more nearly concern all of our Function.

Of this, we apprehend some necessity. 1. Because it is already too obvious, that too many (notwithstanding all pretences of Moderation) do already fly higher than ever; some, in asserting Arminianisme to be the Doctrine of the Church of England, thinking thereby to force all to imbrace it; some, in stickling for the Liturgy commonly used; some, still holding up sole Ordination by, and sole Jurisdiction of Bishops; and, all Canons, not onely made in England, but in Rome it self, (if not repugnant to our Laws;) labouring to possess the people that all these are settled by Law, and therefore to be continued, and imposed, without alteration; and that all who seek a Reformation of them, do oppose and violate the established Laws. 2. Because if men go on in such ways, and prevail therein, it is to be feared, that, in short time, every Minister of different judgement, (how able, godly, and useful soever) will be put, not onely out of his present place, but out of the Ministry also, as it hath already too often happened.

And indeed, it can hardly be found in any age since the Conquest, but that where Kings have not curbed the violence of Bishops, they have ever sharply persecuted all that threw off Popery; which Persecutions usually produced Confusions in the Commonwealth. For prevention whereof, we humbly beseech all Noble Spirits, and faithful prudent Patriots, to look back upon the Mutinies, Insurrections and Rebellions, in Edw. 6. his time, occasioned by fomenting, and not moderating the furious Zeal even of those that were most countenanced by that pious King; which notwithstanding the Act

of

of 1. Edw. 6. 1. occasioned many to flee so high, as exasperated the other side so far, as that it put several parts of the Kingdom into Combustions. Nor will those rivers of blood which was shed in Q. Maries days, by recalling the Bishops and others formerly deprived, and giving way to their wonted tyranny, in the height thereof, be forgotten, while ought of Protestant Religion remaineth. Yea, it will be seasonable to reflect upon the throwing out of many worthy Ministers in Q. Elizabeths reign; and, of many moe, under K. James. For, that Noble King, immediately after his coming to the Crown, was so plyed by Bishops, that, notwithstanding the Conference at Hampton Court, the Prelatical Party prevailed so far, that the Liturgy (then much complained of) remained in greatest part, and in the most material points, unreformed: to which, they all were compelled to subscribe: which had never been required before; and many Illegal Canons were made, and inforced so far, that within the space of two years (as was credibly reported) 70 Ministers were deprived, 113 not suffered to preach; and, about 94 more, were under Canonical Admonition, the next door to Deprivation. The carrying on of all which, together with the countenancing of Arminianism, formerly declared against, by that Learned King James (witness his promoting of the Synod of Dort) did so much, and so generally offend, and exasperate, that, many thousands were compelled to leave their native Countries, to dwell in Mesech, and to take up their habitations in the tents of Kedar; others were drawn on to engage so deeply in the publick differences, (which, as to matters of Religion, were occasioned by the continuing of the corruptions, imposition of the Doctrine, Worship, Episcopal Usurpation, and Discipline, said to be established by Law, but were not so; and, by those high Canons, of 1639.) as produced all those horrid and bloody effects, which we abhor to mention, and tremble to remember.

May it therefore please your Wisdoms, Piety, and Goodness, to procure a Review of all these things, after the example of the Parliament in 3.4. Edw. 6. and, to call some of the most moderate and able persons of the different parties, to assist therein; and thereupon to settle all the things of God in a solid and moderate way; that all Ordinances of Christ may be restored to their pristine Purity,

all

all Christians reduced to the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace: *and, in the mean time, nothing to be imposed which may grieve or offend those who shall be careful not to disturb the Publick Peace. In order to which ends, we humbly recommend to your Noble and Pious thoughts, that of the Apostle;* Let your moderation be known to all men; the LORD is at hand. *For this, and for your Honours,*

Your humble Servants

shall ever pray.

The

The Contents.

THe *Doctrine* of the Church of *England* contained in the 39 *Articles* Page 1.

The *Publick Worship* contained in the *Common-Prayer-Book* Page 8.

Wherein is handled,

1. The *Kalendar* which appointeth the reading of *Lessons* Page --& 18.
2. The *Rubricks* of the Book, in part of the inserted *Sheet*, and Page 22.
3. The Body of the Book it self, in part of that *Sheet*, and Page 26.

The Publick *Rites* and *Ceremonies* commonly used, and pleaded for Page 32.

Of *Church-Government* as founded in the state of *Prelacy* Page 40.

Wherein is treated,

1. Of *Consecration* of *Bishops*, not a distinct *Order* Page 41.
2. Of *Ordination* of *Ministers* Page 44.
3. Of *Ecclestastical Jurisdiction*, not in Bishops alone, by our Laws Page 46.

Their

9. Their *Lowes* by the Laws of *England*. Page [illegible]
Which is now clean taken away, [illegible] to be restored Page 51.
The number of *Bishops*, and *Suffragans*, by *Law*, *are to be* 50. Page 52.
What *Episcopacy* will do God and the King most Service Page 53.
The Publick *Church-Discipline*, what
1. By Law is allowed to be Page 54.
2. No part of the Popes Canons, in force Page 55.
3. What it late was by the *Canons* of 1603. Page 57.
4. The illegality of them, by their repugnancy to the Laws Page *ibid.*
Four *Queres* touching the Legality of all the forementioned Particulars Page 61.

Reasons

REASONS

SHEWING

The Neceſsity of Reformation, &c.

I.

Of Doctrine.

THe Publick *Doctrine* of the *Church of England*, as it is commonly received, and inſiſted upon, is ſaid to be contained in the 39 *Articles, agreed upon by the Archbiſhops and Biſhops of both Provinces, and the whole Clergy, in the Convocation holden at* London, *in the year* 1562. Thoſe *Articles* are taken to be ratified and confirmed by *Act* of *Parliament*, in 13 *Eliz.* cap. 12. Which *Act* provideth, *That no perſon ſhall be admitted to any Benefice with Cure, except he ſhall firſt have ſubſcribed the ſaid Articles in preſence of the* Ordinary, *and publickly read the ſame in the Pariſh Church of that Benefice whereof he ſhall have Cure, with declaration of his unfeigned aſſent thereunto, within two moneths after his Induction,* &c. *upon default hereof, to be* ipſo facto, *immediately deprived.* And, if any Eccleſiaſtical Perſon ſhall *adviſedly maintain, or affirm any Doctrine contrary or repugnant to any of the ſaid Articles*; and being convented, *ſhall perſiſt therein, or not revoke his errour,* or, *after revocation* return again to it, he ſhall be *deprived of his Eccleſiaſtical Promotions.* This is the effect of that *Statute*, as to this Point.

But theſe *Articles* are both *Doubtful*, and *Defective.*

1. *Doubtful.*

1. Becauſe, it appears not that they were all, or any of them confirmed by Parliament in the 13 *Eliz.* for as much as they are not there-

in expresly inserted, nor so much as their *number*; but onely the *Title*-Page of them mentioned. Nor is it known where the Original is enrolled.

2. Of those 39 *Articles*, there were 36 of them set forth (yet not ratified by *Parliament*) in *Edw.6.* his reign: the other were added by the *Convocation*, in *An.* 1562.

3. In the Books of *Articles* now printed, and ever since 10 *Caroli* 1. there is a Declaration of that his late Majesty prefixed thereunto, by the advice and procurement of the then Bishops, (after *Arminianism* began to perk, and to be openly preached by the rising Party) to this effect, *viz.* 1. That those *Articles* contain *the true Doctrine of the Church of* England, *agreeable to Gods Word:* all therefore, are *required to continue in the Uniform Profession thereof*; and, *the least difference from them, prohibited.* 2. That *the Bishops and Clergy, from time to time in Convocation, upon their humble desire, should have licence under the* Broad * Seal, *to deliberate of, and to do all such things, as being made plain by them, and assented unto by his then Majesty, shall concern the setled continuance of the said Doctrine* (as well as *Discipline*) *then established; from which no variying or departing in the least degree, should be endured.* 3. That all *curious search, and disputes*, touching any points contained therein, be *laid aside, and shut up in Gods Promises*, as *generally* set forth, and in the *general meaning of these Articles.* And, *that no man shall either print or preach, to draw any Article aside any way*, nor *put his own sense or Comment* upon it, *but shall take it in the Literal and Grammatical sense of it.* This *Declaration* is published with the said *Articles*, by *Command.*

* This shews who did pen it.

If this be still continued, and confirmed, then all these sad Consequences must needs follow:

1. That no Minister shall have so much liberty to interpret any one of those *Articles*, as is not onely allowed, but required of him, in his *Ordination*, to expound the Word of God it self. But this is a notorious truth, that after that *Declaration* was printed and published, as also a *Proclamation* to the same effect, issued, those of the Prelatical Party had their Spies every where to see who durst to preach a word against any *Arminian* Tenet; or, to explain any one *Article*, as not making for, but against any of those Opinions. If any were found so to do, he was sure to be Convented, for breach of the Kings *Declaration* and *Proclamation*; yea, some have been brought into the *High Commission-Court*, for this very cause. While in the mean time, that other Party took liberty to vent and preach up those points, without controul. Which no *Anti-Arminians* durst call into question; for that the then Bishops of greatest power (who might, by that *Declaration*, obtain licence to explain all things as they thought fit) favoured those *Advocates* of *Arminianism*, and must have been their Judges, if they had been complained of.

2. That

2. That where (in *Art.*16.) it is said, *Not every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism, is a sin against the Holy Ghost*; We may not dare to open the nature of *deadly sin*; nor, to say, that *all sins are deadly*, contrary to the Popish distinction of sins into *mortal* and *venial*. Nor may we presume to explain the next part of that *Article*, *viz. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given*, &c. which Clause, Bishop *Montacute*, and (after him) others allege to prove *falling from grace*; and thereby pretend that this is the *Doctrine of the Church of* England, which is contrary not onely to *Art.*17. but, to 1 *John* 3.9. 1 *Pet.* 1.5.

3. That, it being said (*Art.* 20.) *The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and Authority in Controversies of Faith*; we may not enquire what is meant by the *Church*, whether the Church *Catholick*; or, of *England:* nor what the *Church of England* is: what *Rites* or *Ceremonies* it may ordain: or how far her *Authority* extendeth in *Controversies of Faith*. And if she do happen to ordain ought, *contrary to Gods Word*, or *expound one place of Scripture repugnant to another*; or, to *enforce* any thing to *be believed for necessity of salvation*, that is *beside* the Word; no man may question it; but we must (if a Convocation once declare for it) *assent* and *subscribe* unto it, in the *Literal and Grammatical sense of it*; or, be *deprived of all Ecclesiastical Promotions*.

4. That, whereas the 34 *Article*, treateth of *the Traditions of the Church*, we must not curiously search what is here meant by *Traditions*; and whether it be meant of the *Traditions* of the Church of *Rome*, or of any other Church. But we must rest in this General, That *whosoever, through his private judgement willingly and purposely doth openly break the Traditions and Ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained by common Authority, ought to be rebuked openly, as offending against the common Order of the Church, hurting the Authority of the Magistrate, and wounding the weak*. Whereas, this Church hath no where set forth what she meaneth by *Traditions*; whether distinct from *Ceremonies*, or the same with them: how a *Tradition* may be said to be ordained; and, what is meant by *common Authority*. Yea, if power be given to the *Bishops and Clergy in Convocation*, when and so often as they shall desire it, to *ordain* any more *Traditions*, (which seems to be a strange Expression) and new *Ceremonies*; and, the Royal *Assent* pass thereupon, all Ministers must subscribe thereunto, before they know what they be; yea, before they be ordained: after which, it will be too late to dispute them, or to *vary from them in the least degree*, upon any pretence whatsoever. It will be too late then, for any man to say, They are *repugnant to the Word of God*.

5. That all, being by *Art.* 35. to admit both Books of *Homilies* to

contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine necessary for these times; and therefore, to be *read in Churches by the Ministers diligently*, men must *subscribe* to *false Doctrines*, or assertions. Take instance in but one or two particulars, for brevities sake.

Par. 2. *Hom.* 2. *Of the place and time of Prayer*, pag. 147. *Pluralities of wives was by special Prerogative suffered to the Fathers of the Old Testament, not for satisfying their carnal and fleshly lusts; but, to have many children, because every one of them hoped, and begged oft-times of God in their Prayers, that that blessed seed which God promised should come into the world to break the Serpents head, might come, and be born of his stock and kindred.* As if all did not know, out of what *Tribe* Christ was to issue.

Par. 2. *Hom.* 2. of *Alms*, pag. 160. *The same lesson doth the Holy Ghost teach us in sundry places of the Scripture, saying, Mercifulness and alms-giving, purgeth from all sins, delivereth from death, and suffereth not the soul to come into darkness.* For this, is alledged, *Tob.* 4. *ver.* 10. Then there is added, *The wise Preacher the son of Sirach, confirmeth the same, when he saith, That as water quencheth burning fire, even so mercy and alms resisteth, and reconcileth sins.* (Excellent sense!) For this, *Eccles.* 5. is quoted in the margent. But, it is, *cap.* 3. 30. where the words in the New Translation are, *Alms maketh an atonement for sins.* Of which words, however a charitable construction may be wyre-drawn: yet, those expressions, (the *same lesson* doth the *Holy Ghost* teach us in sundry places of the *Scripture*) evidently admit of these two gross Errours, 1. That the Book of *Tobit* is to be taken for Holy *Scripture*. 2. That it was indited by the *Holy Ghost*. The former of these is contrary to *Art.* 6. in which, only the *Canonical* Books there named, are owned for the Scripture of the *Old Testament*: And that of *Tobit* is there numbred among the *Apocryphals*, which the *Article* saith (out of *Hierom*) the *Church doth not apply to establish Doctrine*: yet, this Homily applies these Apocryphal passages to confirm the *Doctrine* of *Alms deeds*. And as touching the *Holy Ghosts* teaching of this, in those places alledged out of *Tobit*, and *Siracides*, this is denyed by all, who receive not those Books as *Canonical*. Take but one witness (instead of many) King *James*, who, in his Book directed to his Eldest son, and called *Basilicon Doron*, having spoken to him of reading of the Holy Scriptures, saith thus: *As to the Apocrypha Books, I omit them, because I am no Papist: and indeed some of them are no way like the diteement of the Spirit of God.*

6. That, by the 37th *Article* (as it is still printed, and may not be altered) where it is said, *The Queens Majesty hath the chief power in the Realm of England*, &c. (meaning Queen *Elizabeth*, who is after named therein;) all Ministers are bound to read those very words unto this day: and may not say, *The Kings Majesty* hath the chief power;

for

for the *Articles* must be read, every word of them as they are printed with the Kings Declaration before them: or, the Minister must be deprived, if he *alter* any word, or shall not take it in the *sense* of the very *Letter* of it. And if he keep not to all the very words of the *Articles*, who can swear that he did read them after his *Induction*, if put unto it?

7. That by this means, we shall have no *setled* or *fixed Doctrine of the Church of England* at all; if so often as the *Bishops and Clergy* in *Convocation*, shall obtain *License to deliberate* of all such things as they shall think fit to explain, and shall obtain thereto the Royal *Assent*, they may put what sense they please, upon the *Doctrine established*; which, by the *Declaration* prefixed to the *Articles*, is promised to be, *from time to time* granted unto them.

If it be said, *There is an easie Cure for all this. The Declaration before the* 39 *Articles, was never confirmed by any Act of Parliament, nor is now in force: or, if it be, it is but the taking of that away, and causing the Books to be printed without it. So, will the subscribers to the Articles be at as much liberty as by the Act of* 13 *Eliz. was allowed them.*

To this it is Answered, that this will signifie nothing, if Ministers be still tyed to *subscription*. For,

1. It hath been already declared, (yea, *adjudged*) that, by that Statute, there is no liberty for any man to *subscribe* the Articles with any limitation, or explication; if any credit be given to Sir *Edward Cook*, who saith *, that he hath *heard* Wray *chief Justice in the Kings Bench*, Pasch. 23 Eliz. (*quoting* Dier 23 Eliz. 377. lib. 6. fol. 69. Grenes Case, Smiths Case) *report*, *that where one* Smith *subscribed to the said* 39 Articles *of Religion, with this addition* (so far forth as the same were agreeable to the Word of God) *that it was resolved by him, and all the Judges of* England, *that this subscription was not according to the Statute of* 13 Eliz. *Because the Statute required an absolute subscription, and this subscription made it conditional; and that this Act was made for avoiding diversities of opinions*, &c. *And, by this Addition the party might by his own private opinion, take some of them to be against the Word of God: and by this means diversities of opinions should not be avoided, which was the scope of the Statute; and the very Act it self made touching subscription, hereby of none effect.* Thus, He.

* Instit. 4. 47. p. 324. edit. 1658.

2. This shews a necessity of repealing that branch of the Act, so far as it concerneth *subscription*, because, 1. if we may not subscribe with such an addition (*so far forth as the same Articles are agreeable to Gods Word*) it must needs be granted, that the Composers of them are admitted to be *infallible*; and their *Articles*, of equal Authority with Canonical Scripture: or else, that the Statute intended to tyrannize over the Consciences of men; which is not to be imagined. 2. There is no more necessity for Ministers to subscribe those Articles which

that

that *Act* confirmes, then there is for others to subscribe to all other Acts of Parliament which do concern them. If an Act once confirm and ratifie a thing, under a penalty, it will take place, and keep all in as much obedience, as if all the Subscriptions in the world were made to it. It is not particular Subscriptions, but publique Legislative Authority, that makes it a binding Law. 3. This Subscription, is for the most part, required of men, while they be young, and have not time, or solidity throughly to ponder and weigh all the Articles, in the balance of the Sanctuary, or in the scales of the Laws; so that hereby they are cast into a snare ere they be aware; and, by their own inconsiderate and rash act, bound (as men are apt to make them believe, if they afterwards, upon never so just grounds, begin to hesitate) to maintain every of those Articles, although *contrary to the Word of God:* which is expresly contrary to the very Letter of the 20th *Article*, which saith, *It is not lawful to ordain any thing that is contrary to Gods Word written.* And afterwards, *As it ought not to decree any thing against the same* (that is, the *Word*) *so, beside the same, ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation.* But the Statute doth require belief of every one of these Articles, when it enjoyns not only *subscription*, but an *assent* unto them, punishing all with *Deprivation*, that shall *affirm*, and *maintain* any Doctrine *repugnant* to them; which every man must do, if they be found contrariant to the Word; or, he must be false to God. 4. If *subscription* to these, or any other Articles, be still continued, How can any *just liberty be granted to tender Consciences*; But that they must swallow all that is enjoyned, although beside (yea contrary to) the Word, or be persecuted and ruined? Thus much of the *Doubtfulness* of the *Articles*, and of the inconvenience and mischief of *subscribing* them. Which inconvenience and mischief will be greater, if we should be tyed to those Articles alone (though never so sound:) as shall now appear in the *Defectiveness* of them.

2. The *Articles* are *Defective:* Because

1. The sixth *Article*, speaking of the *Holy Scripture*, saith, *In the name of the holy Scripture, we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose Authority there was never any doubt in the Church.* Nevertheless, albeit it enumerate the *Canonical Books* of the *Old Testament* (yea, and all the *Apocrypha* too) yet it nameth not any of the New Testament; but only concludeth thus; *All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account Canonical.* Now, it being not unknown, that there hath been *doubts in the Church*, of some of them; insomuch as the Epistle of St. *James*, the second Epistle of St. *Peter*, and several other books and passages in the *New Testament*, have been not only doubted, but refused; the Article is *defective* in the not enumerating all the Books of the *New Testament*.

2. There

2. There are no *Articles* for discovering and condemning sundry points of *Popery* in Doctrine, which (being first the Tenets of *Arminius*, the first *Protestant* Writer that was not a professed *Lutheran*, that ever openly maintained them) are too commonly suckt in, and cryed up by some, as the *Doctrine* of the *Church of England*, which, since the Reformation, never own'd them; but are all maintained by *Bellarmine*, and generally by all *Franciscans* and *Jesuites*; but confuted by all approved Writers of the Protestant Reformed party, that have written against *Bellarmine* and others of that crew: as likewise by the learned *Whitgift*, *Whitaker*, *Junius*, *Zanchius*, *Pareus*, *Chamier*, Dr. *Prideaux*, and many others. The learned King *James* also took so much notice of, and distaste at those *Arminian-Popish* Opinions touching *Predestination abused*, *universal Redemption*, *universal Grace*, *the manner of conversion*, *and falling from grace*; that his Majesty was the chief procurer and promoter of the late *Synode* of *Dort*, to which he sent Bishop *Carlton*, Dr. *Davenant*, Dr. *Hall*, (afterwards, Bishops) Dr. *Goad*, and Dr. *Balcanqual*, to assist in that Synode; whose judgements touching all those points, were given in to the said *Council*, subscribed with their hands, and afterwards printed and published. Agreeable whereunto, in the main, hath the late *Assembly of Divines* sitting at *Westminster*, declared their judgements in the *Confession of Faith* (afterwards ratified by both Houses of the late Long *Parliment*:) for which reason is that *Assembly* so much slighted, reviled, and opposed.

3. Those Articles contain nothing of the *Creation*, of *Providence*, *Fall* of man, of *Sin*, of the *Punishment* of sin, of Gods *Covenants*, *Effectual Calling*, *Adoption*, *Sanctification*, *Faith*, *Repentance*, *Perseverance*, of the *Law of God*, *Christian liberty* and *Liberty of conscience*, *Religious Worship*, of the *Sabbath* or *Lords day*, of *Marriage* and *Divorce*, the *Communion of Saints*, *Church-government and Discipline*, of the *Resurrection*, or of the *last Judgement*; all which the *Scripture* teacheth, and that, as *necessary*; as appears by the comprizing most of them in the *Apostles Creed*, and therefore necessary to be explained and held forth unto all, as the *Doctrine* of this *Church*; especially considering the differences and Controversies about many of them. Upon this reason it was, that the late Assembly of Divines have taken so much pains to compose several *Articles* (which they call Chapters;) wherein both those of the 39 *Articles* which are held to be indeed fit to be retained, are more fully cleared and explained; and the rest, added, with pertinent proofs of *Scripture*, to make it manifest that they are all evidently grounded upon the Word of God. But, all proofs are wanting in the 39 *Articles*: no text of Scripture being produced to make out any one of them.

II.

Of Worship.

THe Form of *Publick Worship* in *England*, (except *Preaching*) is set down in the *Liturgy* or Book of Common-Prayer, established by Law, in 1 *Eliz.* 2. intituled, *An Act for the Uniformity of Common-Prayer and Service in the Church, and the Administration of the Sacraments.* This Act repealeth another, made in 1 *Mar.* 2. which had repealed a former Statute made in 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. for the *Uniformity of Common-Prayer*, &c. and re-established that *Common-Prayer-Book*, which the said last mentioned Act of *Edw.* 6. had ratified and confirmed. But yet the Act of 1 *Eliz.* which authorizeth and enjoyneth the use of that Book of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. doth it, with allowance of one *alteration or addition of certain Lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the Letany altered and corrected, and two sentences onely added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the Communicants:* but, *none other, or otherwise.*

Now, it is here to be observed, that in the Act of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. for confirming that Book, it is said, that, *The Kings most Excellent Majesty, with th' assent of the Lords and Commons in that Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, had caused the aforesaid Order of common service, intituled,* The Book of Common-Prayer, *to be faithfully and godly perused, explained, and made fully perfect, and by the foresaid Authority annexed and enjoyned it so explained and perfected, to that present Statute.* So that the same was enrolled together with the Act it self. Which being repealed by Queen *Mary*, the Original Book was taken off from the Parliament-Roll, and so lost.

But, in the Act of 1 *Eliz.* 2. there is no mention at all of joyning the Book then revived and re-confirmed, to the said Act: nor doth it appear that ever it was again enrolled, whereby, by having recourse to any Record or Parliament-Roll, it may be proved, that that Book of Common-Prayer, printed in the year 1559. (the first of Queen *Eliz.*) is confirmed by Law, or that any man is bound to use it as the onely form now established by Parliament; or, to be punished for not using it at all.

Quere therefore whether he that either useth them not; or useth other, be puhishable.

And albeit the *Act* of 1 *Eliz.* taketh notice of some *alterations* above mentioned, to be made in the Book then ratified, yet it doth not name, nor express what those *alterations* were. So that all men are left in a blind touching the same, if put to prove that those alterations now found in the printed Common-Prayer Books, are the very same, which the last mentioned Act intended to allow and confirm.

Howbeit,

Howbeit, that we may go so far as we can herein, take notice that by comparing the Book printed in 5,6, *Edw.* 6. with that which was printed in 1 *Eliz.* the alterations therein found (which are onely hinted in the Stat. of 1 *Eliz.* 2.) are these:

1. As touching *Proper Lessons*. The *Kalendar* of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. appointed no *Proper Lessons* for *Sundays* (except for *Easter-day*, *Whitsunday*, and *Trinity Sunday*) but onely for *Holy-Days*. The *Lessons* for all other Sundays, were onely set down in the *Kalendar* in ordinary course of reading the rest of the Bible, upon that, and other days of the week, in a continued way of reading all. But, the Book, in 1 *Eliz.* in the Kalendar of *Proper Lessons*, hath it thus; *Proper Lessons to be read, for the first Lessons both at morning Prayer and evening Prayer on the Sundays, throughout the year; and, for some also, the second Lessons.* Then, it after adds, *Lessons proper for Holy Days.* All which *proper Lessons* were appointed in 1 *Eliz.* to take place of all Chapters which in ordinary course of reading, according to the day of each moneth, had been before ordered in the Kalendar to be read, without respect to either *Sunday* or Holy-Day, but onely to the day of the moneth in course. What *alterations* have been made either in that Book printed *An.* 1559. 1 *Eliz.* of other *proper Lessons*, not warranted by the Act of 1 *Eliz.* 2. (namely, of such as were before appointed for *Holy-days*, &c.) or that have been made since, shall be afterwards shewed.

2. As touching the *Letany*, there is no material alteration in that, save onely this; that whereas both the Books of 2 *Edw.* 6. ran thus: *From all sedition and privy conspiracy, from the tyranny of the Bishop of* Rome, *and all his detestable Enormities, from all false Doctrine and Heresie*, &c. those words touching the *tyranny of the Bishop of* Rome, *and all his detestable Enormities*, are left out in 1 *Eliz.* 2. and ever sithence.

3. In the Sacrament of the *Lords Supper*, the words used at the delivery of the *bread, and wine*, ran thus: *Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ dyed for thee, and feed on him in thine heart by faith with thanksgiving:* but in the Book of 1 *Eliz.* and in all since, the words are these: *The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life; take and eat this in remembrance that Christ dyed for thee, and feed on him in thine heart by faith with thanksgiving.* The words at giving the Cup, in 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. were these: *Drink this in remembrance Christs blood was shed for thee, and be thank ful.* But in 1 *Eliz.* and since, the words are, *The Blood of our Jesus Christ which was shed for thee, preserve thy Body and Soul into everlasting life; drink this, in remembrance [illegible]ists Blood was shed for thee, and be thank ful.* Now, it is to be noted, that, whereas onely the two former Clauses, which run in the forms of Prayers, were in the Book of 2. *Edw.* 6. and the two latter Clauses onely, are in the Book of

5. 6. *Edw.* 6. as here above ſhewed, that Book of 1. *Eliz.* takes in, and joyns them both together. If theſe be not the *alterations* to which the Act of 1 *Eliz.* referreth, it will be very difficult (if not impoſſible) to find what they were.

Now having thus prepared the way to ſpeak to the *neceſſity* of *Reformation* in *Worſhip*, it is deſired that all Readers of this Piece, will take notice, that there was lately printed, in one ſheet of Paper, *ſome of the Differences and alterations in the preſent Common-Prayer-Book from that which was eſtabliſhed by Law* in 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. and in 1 *Eliz.* (or, at leaſt ſuppoſed ſo to be) which is but a *Specimen*, or ſhort hint of what is here intended to be ſet forth more largely and fully: and that, in the ſame Order and Method which is there propounded; (none of thoſe printed Papers being now left) it is thought fit to reprint and inſert that ſheet (with ſome few Reviſals) in this larger Tract, which ſhall now follow in the next place. And then after that, we ſhall add what ſhall be neceſſary for making out more fully the neceſſity of reforming the whole *Liturgy*; not by way of *reducing*, ſo much as of *new moulding* the whole.

Some

Some of the

DIFFERENCES and ALTERATIONS

In the present

Common-Prayer-Book,

FROM

The Book established by Law, in *quinto & sexto, Edw. 6.* and 1 *Eliz.*

The KALENDAR.

THere are sundry Saints days (although in black Letters) not found in the Books of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. or 1. *Eliz.* to the number of 50. and more. Which however it may seem a small matter, yet Time may turn them into *Red* Letters, and so claim observance of them. For Dr. *Cousens* in his *Kalendar* (which he calls the *Kalendar of the Church*) in his Book of *Devotion*, hath put one of them already, *viz.* St. *Barnabies* Day, into *Red*. But, however the *Epistle and Gospel* for that day, and for *the Conversion of St. Paul*, be extant in the Service-Book; (and, in the *Liturgy* printed for *Scotland*, An. 1637. both these are put into *Red*, and enjoyned to be observed) yet in 2. *Edw.* 6. and in 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. those days were expunged out of the Catalogue of Holy Days.

On *Aug.* 7. *The Name of Jesus* is put in for an old *Holy-day*; which, however used in times of Popery, (but, under a more gentle Title *a*) yet even in 2. as well as in 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. and 1 *Eliz.* it was expelled. Howbeit, Dr. *Cousens*, in his fore-mentioned *Devotions*, hath already set down proper Lessons

a *Fest. Jesu.*

for that *day*, *viz. Mat.* 1. and *Philip.* 2. which shews how desirous some are to keep an Holy-day to a Name.

The Order for Proper Lessons.

On *Whitsunday*, 1. *Eliz.* the *first Lesson* at *Even. Prayer*, was *Deut.* 18. now, that is thrust out, and *Wisd.* 1. crept into the room. And if we look into the *Lessons* for *Holy-days*, we shall find many Chapters of the *Canonical* Scripture laid aside, and *Apocryphal* Chapters ordered to be read. See some instances in the Margent, at the Letter *C*.

Old Kalendar.	The New.
Jan. 5 Gen. 46.	*Wisd.* 5.
5. Gen. 47.	*Wisd.* 6.
Feb. Exod. 12.	*Wisd.* 9.
Exod 13.	*Wisd.* 12.
Feb. 24. Numb. 33.	*Wisd.* 19.
Jun. 5 Job 31.	*Eccles.*
9. Job 32.	*Eccles.* 15.
Jul. 5 Eccles.	*Eccles.* 19.
Eccles.	*Eccles.* 21.
Eccles. 11.	*Eccles.* 23.
Aug. Ezek 3.	*Eccles.* 25.
4. Ezek. 6.	*Eccles.* 29.
Sep. 5 Mic. 7.	*Eccles* 35.
1. Naum. 1.	*Eccles.* 38.
Sept. 5 Zach 7.	*Eccles.* 39.
9. Zach. 8.	*Eccles.* 44.
Octob. 18. Judg. 14.	*Eccles.* 51.
Dec. 28. Isa. 60.	*Wisd.* 1.

There are sundry other Lessons altered, which I here omit. It is true, the *Stat.* of 2. *Edw.* 6. alloweth *one alteration or addition of certain Lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year*: but, after mention of some *by name*, it addeth, *And none other, or otherwise*. Also in the present *Kalendars*, there are four Chapters of *Joshua* left out, that were in the *Kalendars* of 5. and 6. *Edw.* 6. And, on *Octob.* 13. *Judith* 15. 16. are appointed now to be read; which was not so in 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. This deserves consideration, seeing so many *Canonical* Chapters of use, are not at all appointed to be read in publick.

The Rubricks.

The first Page of the present Books, appoint Ministers to use such Ornaments as were of use in 2. *Edw.* 6. not declaring what they be. The Book established in 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. names a *Surplice onely*. The Book of *Canons*, *Can.* 24. enjoyneth other Ornaments. Hereby some *Ministers* must break that *Canon*, or the present *Rubrick*, which the 14th *Canon* requireth all to observe. So that the 14th *Canon* and the 24th contradict each other. And neither

The Book of 2. *Edw.* 6. enjoyned onely a *surplis* in Parish Churches and Chappels. See last page of that Book, where are *notes for explanation*. So also, in *Rubr.* before *Morn. Prayer*. 5. 6. *Edw.* 6.

ther those *Canons*, nor that Rubrick, nor this Book, are established by Law.

After the *Communion*, there are in all Service-Books of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. seven *Rubricks*. Which number remaineth; but, the Third is divided into two, and the fourth wholly lost. In which fourth, the Compilers had solidly and excellently declared in what sense they intended *Kneeling at the Communion*. The loss whereof hath occasioned much stumbling and offence; yea, much trouble and persecution. That *Rubrick* was this.

Although no Order can be so perfectly devised, but it may be of some, either for their Ignorance and Infirmity, or else of Malice and Obstinacy, misconstrued, depraved, or interpreted in a wrong part; yet because brotherly Charity willeth that, so much as conveniently may be, Offences should be taken away; therefore we willing to do the same. Whereas it is Ordained in the Book of Common-Prayer, in the Administration of the Lords Supper, that the Communicants, kneeling, should receive the Holy Communion; which thing being well meant for a signification of the humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ, given unto the Worthy Receiver, and to avoid the profanation and disorder which about the holy Communion might else ensue. Lest yet the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare, that it is not meant thereby, that any Adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread & Wine there bodily received, nor unto any real and essential Presence there being of Christs natural flesh and blood. For, as concerning the Sacramental Bread and Wine, they remain still in their very natural Substances, and therefore may not be adored: for, that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. And, as concerning the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in Heaven, and not here: for it is contrary to the truth of Christs true natural Body to be in moe places than one, at one time.

The Body of the Book it self.

There is a whole Prayer now left out, at the end of the

Letany,

Letany, which was extant in the Books of 5. *6. Edw.* 6. to be uſed in times of Dearth or Famine: which was this:

O God merciful Father, which in the time of Heliſeus *the Prophet, didſt ſuddenly turn in* Samaria, *great ſcarcity and dearth into plenty and cheapneſs, and extream famine into abundance of victual; have pity upon us that now be puniſhed for our ſins with like adverſity. Encreaſe the fruits of the Earth by thy heavenly benediction; and grant that we receiving thy bountiful liberality, may uſe the ſame to thy glory, our comfort, and relief of our needy Neighbours, through Jeſu Chriſt our Lord, Amen.*

Moreover, there are ſundry Prayers (ſome before ſome in King *James* his time) put into the preſent Leiturgy; as alſo ſome things into the Catechiſm, which are not confirmed by Parliament. Which Additions (although uſeful) being not legally ratified, hath imboldened ſome to make alterations at their pleaſure. For inſtance, The Prayer for the *Queen* and Royal *Family*, before the year 1627. began thus; *Almighty God which haſt promiſed to be a Father of thine elect and of their ſeed:* but now, thus; *Almighty God the fountain of all goodneſs.* Which change was a great Preſumption, and may ſeem to imply an excluſion of the Royal Stem out of the number of Gods *Elect*. This alteration was firſt made in the Books appointed to be uſed, about that time, at publick Faſts; and thence, was ſtollen into the Book of Common-Prayer. Of which, no reaſon can be diſcovered, unleſs this; that the word *Elect*, diſtaſted the favourers of Popiſh *Arminianiſm*.

Likewiſe the reading Pſalms, now thruſt into the Common Prayer Books, (pretended to be eſtabliſhed by Law) were no part thereof in 5. *6. Edw.* or in 1. *Eliz.* For neither of the Books then printed in *Folio*, for publick uſe in Churches, had the Pſalms in them; but only a direction what Pſalms ſhould every day be read; which were accordingly read out of the Bibles then uſed in Churches. It is therefore, very hard, and unreaſonable, to continue that Tranſlation; and, to enjoyn, and tye men to read out thoſe abuſed Pſalms, as now they ſtand in that Book. And it is a great wrong to the people: that Verſion being very defe-

ctive and corrupt. Take ſome inſtances wherein that differs from the Kings laſt authorized Tranſlation now only allowed to be read in Churches; as alſo, from the Original it ſelf.

Pſal. 28. 9. *The Lord is my ſtrength.* In the new, thus, *The Lord is their ſtrength*, ver. 8. *Old Tranſl.*

37. 38. *Keep innocency, and take heed to the thing that is right.* In the new, *Mark the perfect man, and behold the juſt*, ver. 37.

58. 8. *So let indignation vex them as a thing that is raw.* In the new, *He taketh them away as with a whirlewind, both living and in his wrath*, ver. 9.

68. 6. *Maketh men to be of one mind in an houſe.* In the new, *Setteth the ſolitary in families.*

105. 28. *They were not obedient.* In the new, *They rebelled not againſt his word* *.

107. 40. *Though he ſuffer them to be evil intreated.* In the new, *He poureth contempt upon Princes.*

125. 3. *The rod of the wicked cometh not.* In the new, *the rod of the wicked reſteth not upon the lot of the righteous.*

* *Let which of thoſe by* Fuller *or* Dr. Prideaux *be thought the better; yet, while they both ſtand, they cauſe ſcandal.*

In *Pſal.* 14. there are three whole Verſes, which are not in the Original, nor in the reviſed Tranſlation, nor in the Greek 72. but only in the Popiſh vulgar Bibles. To excuſe it by ſaying, All thoſe Verſes are found together in *Rom.* 3. is a fig-leaf. For, the Apoſtle never meant to produce all thoſe words as taken out of one place; but only to collect out of ſeveral Texts of the Old Teſtament, ſundry teſtimonies to prove *all men to be ſinners*. Accordingly, he took three Verſes out of *Pſal.* 14. one out of *Pſal.* 140. another out of *Pſal.* 10. another out of *Iſa.* 59. All which, the Old Tranſlators unadviſedly thruſt into the 14. *Pſalm*, as parts of that one Scripture.

I forbear to mention other *Pſalms*, wherein, ſometimes words, ſometimes whole verſes are left out; and, much of the reſt is very improperly and impertinently tranſlated: which in the Leiturgy provided for *Scotland*, was redreſſed; yet the Book (for ſundry other defects, impertinencies, and redun-

redundances) was refused: This makes sport for Papists and Atheists, to find how much our Translations publickly used, do enterfere, and jar; and how corrupt some of them be.

Thus of the differences between the old Common-prayer-books confirmed by Law, and the present Common-prayer-books so much magnified and adored, not only by the common sort, but by too many of those who pretend to learning and skill in the Publike *Offices* of the Church of *England*; but abuse the people; yea, Magistracy, and God himself therein. For, still the *Preface* of the Book runs thus: *That nothing is enjoyned to be read, but that which is the pure word of God, or that which is evidently grounded thereupon:* which (as our bold Masters have ordered the matter) is false, and a meer cheat put upon the people of God.

Having thus given a taste of the Differences between the Old and New Books, I hold it needful to shew how unsafe it might be hereupon to conclude no more but this: *Then let the present Book of Common-prayer be compared with the old that was established, and be reformed by it.* For, even in the Book that was established by Parliament, there are sundry incongruous and uncomely expressions, unwarrantable passages, and, some gross mistakes of the Scripture it self; especially in the Translations of the *Epistles* and *Gospels*. Which Translation used in the Book of Common-prayer, is as antient as the 35. of *Hen.* 8. (and used first in private *Primmars*, being translated out of the Mass-books and other Offices of the Romish Church) for want of a better Translation in the Reign of *Edward* the sixth. For Example,

The old Translation.

Gosp. on 2 Sund. after *Epiph.* *When men be drunk.* But, in the new, *When men have well drunk.*

Epist. on 4 Sund. in *Lent.* *Mount Sinai is Agar in Arabia, and bordereth upon the City which is now called Jerusalem:* a gross mistake both of Scripture, and Topography. The new Translation therefore renders it thus: *This Hagar*

Indeed Dr. Prideaux saith, all these are amended in the Kings New Translation of the Bible.

But what is this to the Service-book, in which these corrupt passages are still printed, and pressed to be read in Divine Service?

is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Hierusalem which now is. He saith not, *Mount Sinai is Agar*; for, that is not so. But, *Hagar is mount Sinai:* that is, a representation or figure of it. Nor doth the Apostle say, that *mount Sinai in Arabia bordered upon Hierusalem.* For, that is false; *Arabia* being many hundred miles distant from *Hierusalem.* And the *Mount* whereof St. *Paul* speaks, was a type of it, not *bordering* on it.

Epist. on *Palm-*Sunday. *He was found in his apparel as a man.* In the new, *He was found in fashion as a man.* The word is σχήμα· which imports, not apparel, but the form, or figure, which includeth the real substance and true nature of the thing whereof it is a form.

Epist. on 16 Sun. after *Trin.* *Which is Father of all that is called father in heaven and in earth.* Then, the Father, must needs be Father to himself. The new Translation, therefore renders it, *Of whom the whole family of heaven and earth is named.* So the Original, ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται.

Much more might be added, not only against the present unestablished Leiturgy, but against that which was confirmed. But this shall suffice. For my intention neither is, nor ever was, to destroy, or cast off all Forms: but only to shew some grounds of exception against this. And seeing this is so much cried up, that the most, place all their Devotion and Religion in it, and come little short of the Israelites in abusing of the *brazen Serpent*, which by Gods own command, was erected in the Wilderness; Authority may consider whether it be not honourable, safe, and necessary to deal with both Books, as *Hezekiah* did with that Idolized *Serpent*; and carefully to provide a better in the room; as

that good King did, in reforming the whole Publick Service of God: there being now far better means, and fairer opportunities of so doing, than in the times of compiling the Antient Leiturgy by those Reverend and Renowned Bishops and Matyrs that did compose it.

ROM. 10. 22.

Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.

Having reprinted the foregoing Sheet, we must now go on, in the same Order and Method (as was before promised) to observe some more incongruous and unworthy passages (all which call for a New Form of *Liturgy*) in the rest of the *Kalendar*, *Rubricks*, and *Body* of the Book it self.

I.

In the KALENDAR.

THE *Kalendar* is either that which appoints *Proper* Lessons for *Sundays* and *Holy-days* (to speak in the *Common-prayer-book* Language) or that which in each Month sheweth what Chapters are to be daily read on week-days, according to the days of the month; and is prefixed, in all Editions, to the Book it self.

In the *Proper Lessons* appointed for *Holy-days*. The Kalendar of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. omitteth proper Lessons for the *Conversion of Paul*, because that was then no Holy-day, but abrogated by the Act of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. ca. 3. Therefore in the Common *Kalendar* then established, the first Lessons for that day (being *Jan.* 25.) as being a Common-day of the Week, were *Gen.* 46. and *Gen.* 47. But in the Book of 1 *Eliz.* these two Chapters are laid by, and *Wisd.* 5, and 6. put in the room. This (however toucht upon in the printed Sheet) is here again taken notice of, to shew by this (among other arguments) that the Book then printed was not confirmed by 1. *Eliz.* 2. because that Act admits of no *alterations* of Lessons on *Holy-days*, or other days, save only on

Sun-

Sundays. Yet is this also thrust into the New Scotish *Leiturgy*, and that day, made an *Holy-day* again.

And whereas in all the proper Lessons for *Holy-days* in 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. only *All Saints* day, had, for those Lessons, *Wisd.* 3, and 5. and all other *Holy-day* Lessons were Lessons out of the *Canonical Books*; the *Kalendar* of 1 *Eliz.* hath appointed 20. more *Apocryphal* Chapters for *Holy-days*, and thrust out so many Canonical Chapters, that by the *Kalendar* of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. were appointed for those very days; as for instance.

	Kalendar 5. 6. *Edw.*	*Kal.* of 1 *Eliz.*
On the *Purification.*	None: yet, on *Feb.* 1 (which is the Day) *Exod.* 12. *Exod.* 13.	*Wisd.* 9. *Wisd.* 12.
On St. *Mathias.*	None: yet, on *Feb.* 25. (which is the Day) *Numb.* 33. *Numb.* 34.	*Wisd.* 19. *Ecclus.* 3.
On the *Annunciat.*	None: yet, on *Mar.* 25. (which is the day) *Josh.* 21. *Josh.* 22.	*Ecclus.* 2. *Eccl.* 3.
On St. *Mark.*	None: yet, on *Apr.* 25 (which is the day) 2 *Sam.* 3. 2 *Sam.* 4.	*Ecclus* 4. *Ecclus.* 5.
On St. *Barnaby.*	None: 'tis no holy-day. Yet on *June* 11. *Hest.* 3. *Hest.* 4.	*Eccl.* 10. *Eccl.* 12.
On St. *Peter.*	None: yet on *Jun.* 29. (which is the day) *Job*, 31. *Job.* 32.	*Eccl.* 15. *Eccl.* 19.
On St. *James.*	None: yet on *July* 25. (which is the day) *Eccles.* 10. *Eccles.* 11.	*Eccl.* 21. *Eccl.* 23.
On St. *Barthol.*	None: yet, on *Aug.* 24. (which is the day) *Ezek.* 3. *Ezek.* 6.	*Eccl.* 25. *Eccl.* 29.
On St. *Matthew.*	None: yet, on *Sept.* 21. (which is the day) *Mic.* 7. *Naum* 1.	*Eccl.* 35. *Eccl.* 38.
On St. *Mich.*	None: yet, on *Sept.* 29. (which is the day) *Zech.* 7. *Zech.* 8.	*Eccl.* 39. *Eccl.* 44.

Can we think there could ever have been so much boldness in those that printed the *Common-Prayer-Book* in 1 *Eliz.* to make so many alterations, in that very year wherein the Act of *Eliz.* passed for confirmation of that in 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. (which admits not of one of them:) if that Book (which hath been followed ever since) printed in 1 *Eliz.* were the very Book then re-established? And is not every Minister which readeth those *Apocryphals* on the days aforesaid, punishable (if he persisteth therein) by the *Act* of 1. *Eliz.* 2?

And here, let it be noted, that albeit there be sundry whole *Canoni-*

cal Books left out, and no less then 188. Chapters of the Old Testament not read at all: yet, of the *Apocrypha*, which contains but 173 Chapters, there are read 121 Chapters, by the *Kalendar* of 5.6. *Edw.* 6. as well as the *Kalendars* of later date. Whereas St. *Hierom* in his directions for reading the Scriptures in private, by an holy woman, gives warning, *Caveat omnia Apocrypha.* Let her beware of all the *Apocrypha.* Which is not unlike to that of King *James*, to his *Son*, who, by saying, (*I omit them, because I am no Papist*) declares plainly, that such husks were first cast before the Church by *Popery*, and is fit food for none but doting Papists. No more is that *Kalendar*, of 5.6. *Edw.* 6. from *Octob.* 5. to *Novemb.* 28. wherein very few *Canonical* Chapters are appointed to be read.

We shall now offer one Observation out of the late compiled *Liturgy* for *Scotland*, which is this; that (however so many *Apocryphal* Chapters still stand in our *Liturgies*:) in all the *Kalendar* for *Scotland*, there are but 12. *Apocryphals* to be read in their Churches (which yet, they would not endure:) this shews plainly, that our great zealous Masters who gave order for the Composing of that Book, had somewhat upon their Consciences that rounded them in the ear against the continuing so many *Apocryphals* in ours: especially considering that some of them, have been reputed but *Fables* (as namely the Book of *Judith*, the History of *Susanna*, &c.) acted first in *Interludes* or *Plays*. And some of the Chapters contain meer delusions and lyes: yet even those very Chapters are appointed to be read in our Churches.

To make this last out, take notice of somewhat observed before, out of the second *Homily* of *Alms-deeds*, which quoteth *Tobit* 4. and *Eccluc.* 5. (both being appointed to be read, the one *Octob.* 6. the other *Octob.* 30.) which I here pass over. In *Tobit* 3. (appointed by the Kalendar of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. to be read *Octob.* 6.) where mention is made, ver. 8. that *Sarah the daughter of Raguel* had been *marryed to seven husbands, whom Asmodeus the evil spirit, had killed, before they had lien with her.* (a likely matter!) Yet was she *reproached* by her own *Fathers maids*, that *she had strangled them all.* In *Tobit* 3. (ordered to be read *Octob.* 9.) ver. 9. it is said, *Alms doth deliver from death, and shall purge away all sin.* What need then the bloud of Christ? And in ver. 15. one *Raphael* telleth *Tobit*, thus: *I am Raphael one of the seven holy Angels, which present the prayers of the Saints, and which go in and out before the glory of the holy One.* Whereas none but the *Angel of the Covenant*, now at the right hand of God to make intercession for the Saints, do present their prayers, *Revel.* 8. 3. This *Raphael* was far from being one of the *Angels that go in and out before the glory of the holy one*; for he was a lying either man, or spirit. This was he that was hired by *Tobias*, son to *Tobit*, to shew him the way to *Rages*; and being asked by *Tobit* himself, of what Tribe he was, answered, *I am Azarias the son of Ana-*

Ananias the great, and of thy brethren, Tob. 5. 12. Now, you find him in two tales to the same man: in one of which he must needs lye. They that desire to read more of his pranks, may read that Book of *Tobit*: and particularly, Chap. 6. where he taught *Tobias* how to chase away the Devil, by taking the *heart*, the *liver* and *gall* of a *fish*, and thereof to make a *smoak*, which when the Devil (who was said to be in love with *Sarah* before named, and therefore in the Marriage-Chamber, had killed those seven husbands, before mentioned, who had marryed her) should *smell*, he should *flee away, and never come again any more*. And are not these gallant Chapters to be read in Churches? yet our Kalendar appointeth them to be read, *viz. Tob.* 5. and 6. on *Octob.* 7.

So likewise *Judith*, cap. 9. (appointed to be read, *Octob.* 16.) tells a story of a prayer which her self made to God, (when she had it in design to cut off *Holofernes* head:) in which prayer she takes notice of father *Simeon* (who with *Levi* slew the *Shechemites*, for deflouring their sisters; *Gen.* 34.) and tells God, concerning the *Shechemites*, ver. 4. *Thou hast given their wives for a prey, and their daughters to be captives, and all their spoils to be divided among thy dear children, which were moved with thy zeal, and abhorred the pollution of their blood, and called upon thee for aid*, &c. Can we think this pious *Amazon*, had ever read *Jacobs* censure of that fact of *Simeon* and *Levi*, and his curse upon it, *Gen.* 49. 5, 6, 7. even while he was *blessing* the rest of his Sons (except incestuous *Reuben*) at the very point of death? *Simeon and Levi are brethren, instruments of cruelty are in their habitations. O my soul, come not thou into their secret: unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united: for in their anger they slew a man, and in their self-will they digg'd down a wall. Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce; and their wrath, for it was cruel. I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel.*

The rest of her prayer is conformable to this. Therefore she prayeth, ver. 10. (in reference to *Holofernes* and his men) *smite by the deceit of my lips* (for she meant to destroy him by lying) *the servant with the prince, and the prince with his servant*, &c. And in ver. 13. *Make my speech and deceit to be their wound and stripe*, &c. Was not this a brave resolution, a pious petition, to *tell a lye for God?* We forbear more instances, because we delight not to scrape in such Dung-hills. We have done with the *Kalendar*.

II.

Of the RUBRICKS.

Rubricks are Directions given in the Common-Prayer-Book, how to officiate and read the said Book, in the several parts thereof. And they are called *Rubricks*, because anciently printed in *Red Letters*; and are as much established by Law, as any other part of the Book of Common-Prayer it self. I shall instance onely in some of them, not medling with those before noted in the inserted Paper of *Differences*.

1. There are many *Rubricks* wherein the Minister is called *Priest*, which is the old Stile and Title in the Mass-Book, from whence it was taken. We never finde it in the New Testament; but onely in the Old: which Title was then given to such of the *Levites* as were made Priests to sacrifice at the *Altar*. And thence the Papists borrowed that name for their Popish Sacrificers at their Altars. It is now then, a meer Superstitious and Antichristian Name, no way warranted by the Word of God, in the Pontifician Sense; yet is it used above fifty times in our *Liturgy*. It is true, one seeks to excuse it by saying, Use hath made this so Popular, as it is not safe to remove it; yet, confesseth it may be altered without prejudice to Religion. But why may not the Word *Priest* be taken away, and the word *Minister* put in the room? The Name of *Minister* is not unknown: yea, it is as often used in the *Rubricks* of the same Book, as the name *Priest*. Therefore it may, without the least danger, or offence, be wholly obliterated. Hence it is, that in the Scots Liturgy it is wholly omitted, and *Presbyter* put into the room thereof. Whereas this is a more strange and unknown name, being borrowed from the Greek πρεσβύτερος, which was never used to signifie a Priest, but an Elder, and thence borrowed to denote a *Minister*, as all the Learned know: and none but Papists use the word Priest; unless Scoffers at Ministers, whom in scorn and derision they call and nick-name, *Priests*.

2. In the fifth *Rubrick* of the *Order for reading of the holy Scripture*, it is said, *That the Collects, Epistle and Gospel appointed for the Sunday, shall serve all the week after, except there fall some Feast that hath his proper.* By vertue of this, these in *Cathedrals* were read every day, albeit they had no *Communions*. But another *Rubrick* prefixed to the *Epistles and Gospels*, runs thus: *The Collects, Epistles and Gospels to be used at the celebration*

lebration of the Lords Supper, and holy Communion, throughout the year. These therefore were never intended to be read, but when there is the Sacrament of the Lords Supper administred. This was anciently administred every day, in the Church of *England*; and so, to be used still, at least in *Cathedrals*, as appears by the Rubrick after the first *Exhortation at the Communion.* If then, upon any reasonable cause, there be no Communion, there ought at that time to be no *Epistle* and *Gospel* read. If there be any read, it is without warrant. So that these two *Rubricks* fight; and which to follow, is uncertain. And indeed, they are both but blind guides that lead into the ditch, and make a man obnoxious to the Law.

3. The *Rubrick* before the *general Confession at the Communion*, runs thus: *Then shall this general Confession be made in the name of all those that are to receive the holy Communion, either by one of them, or else by one of the Ministers.* This gives liberty to Lay, or private men to officiate, in part at least, as to this *Confession*, which is a branch of the Office peculiar to the Minister, to be *the mouth of the people unto God in Prayer*; especially in the Administration of the Sacraments, in the Congregation. What is this but to admit a private person to assist and bear a share in administring the *Lords Supper?* Is not this to hit against the 17 *Article* of Religion, which declares it to be *unlawful* to any but such as be *lawfully called, and sent*; to wit, *Ministers* duly ordained? In all other parts of the Liturgy, all *Confessions* and *Prayers* are expresly put upon the Minister alone, at least to begin, and lead the Congregation therein.

4. In the Rubricks before the *proper Prefaces* at the Communion, it is said, that *upon Christmas day, and seven days after*; upon *Easter-day*, and *seven days* after; upon the *Ascention-day*, and *seven days* after; upon *Whitson-day*, and *six days* after, the same several *Prefaces* appointed for each of these solemn days, shall be read; as if every of the seven days following were one and the same with the first; and, what was done on the first day, was done over again every one of the following days: which yet was never done but once; and, but upon one day, at all; and perhaps, upon neither of those days on which it is said there to be done. But, of this, more, when we come to speak of the *Body* of the Book.

5. The last *Rubrick* after the Communion, saith, *Note, that every Parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one; and shall also receive the Sacraments, and other rites*, &c. But, the first *Exhortation* before the Communion, to be used when the people are *negligent to come unto it*, requireth the Minister to say unto the whole Congregation, *I bid you all that be here present, and beseech you for the Lord Jesus Christs sake, that ye will not refuse to come thereto, being so lovingly called and bidden of God himself.* Yet the a-

foresaid

foresaid *Rubrick* seems to dispense with Gods own Invitation? How rightly, let all sober men consider. And if thrice communicating will suffice, (contrary to the Primitive Practise, which was, for all to Communicate at every solemn meeting) why must *Easter* be one of the *three times*, more then any other *Lords Day*, seeing every *Lords Day* is celebrated upon the same account that that called Easter-day, is, *viz.* in memory of the *Resurrection* of our Lord?

But where it is added in that *Rubrick*, He shall also *receive the Sacraments, and other rites*, &c. this is no other but non-sense, or worse. For, what *Sacraments* else are there for a Communicant of the Lords Supper to receive? Is *Baptism* to be reiterated? are the Popish Sacraments to be recalled? And if they were, must every Parishioner receive them; and that *thrice a year?* And what are the *Rites* he must receive? Be they *Ceremonies? Humane Inventions? Superstitious antique Crossings; duckings, bowing to the Altar, towards the East, to Images*, &c? If so, where are these, or any of these enjoyned? And, if not enjoyned, why must they be all received thrice a year; or, at all? But of this, more hereafter.

6. The last *Rubrick* before the *Catechism*, in order to *Confirmation*, concludeth thus: *And that no man shall think that any detriment shall come to children by deferring of their Confirmation, he shall know for truth, that it is certain by Gods Word, that children being baptized, have all things necessary for their salvation, and be undoubtedly saved.* Where is that *Word of God?* This cannot be understood of Children, after Baptism, dying in Infancy; for it speaks of such as are capable of *Confirmation*; and, of Confirmation *deferred*. This supposeth their living a good while after *Baptism*; even till they come to some understanding, and are able to give some good account of the *Catechism*, (else can they not be admitted to Confirmation, as appears by the first *Rubrick* before Confirmation:) before which time, they may be guilty of many actual sins; every of which (without true repentance) makes lyable to Condemnation. So that this Rubrick gives to Children once baptised, more assurance of their *undoubted salvation*, than ever God hath given them. For, if they be baptised, let them live or die, be godly or wicked, they must *know for truth*, *that it is certain*, (but not by Gods Word:) they *not onely have all things* (on Gods part) *necessary to salvation*; but, are *undoubtedly saved*. Is this a truth?

7. The Rubrick after *Matrimony*, saith, *The new-married persons the same day of their marriage, MUST receive the holy Communion.* Who do so? what necessity of so doing? And if they do not so, who shall be punished for their omission? The Minister, if any body; because he is bound to do all things according to the Book, if established; and *not otherwise*. And if the marryed Persons will not receive, what can the *Minister* do? As for the marryed persons, they (by the *Rubrick*

before

before mentioned) are not bound to receive above thrice in one year; which, if they do, they need not receive on their *marriage-day*.

8. In the last *Rubrick* after *Communion of the sick*, it is said, *In the time of the Plague, Sweat, or such other like contagious times of Sicknesses or Diseases, when none of the Parish, or Neighbours, can be gotten to communicate with the sick in their Houses, for fear of the Infection, upon special request of the diseased, the Minister may onely communicate with him.* By this, the Minister is bound not onely to visit every person sick of the *Plague*, &c. (standing at some distance) but, to administer the *Lords Supper* also to him, if he desire it; and that *alone*, if none else will joyn, as it is not to be expected they should. This is no way agreeable to *Christianity*, or common *Humanity*.

Not to *Christianity*: for, first, the very nature of the Sacrament requires a publick Administration, because there must be a Communion of more then two persons in the receiving of it. This appears plainly by several other *Rubricks* of the same Book. For, 1. in the first *Rubrick* after the publick Communion, it is ordered, that, *if there be not above twenty persons in the Parish, of discretion to receive the Communion, yet there shall be no Communion, except four, or three at the least communicate with the Priest.* If it be said, this is the Order for Publick Communions; but, it concerns not Private Communions of the sick: it is answered, 1. that it appears not by the Word, that there is any *warrant*, much less *necessity* for such private *Communions*: for, the first *Rubrick* after Communion of the sick, directeth the Minister thus: *If a man, either by extremity of sickness, or for want of warning in due time to the Curate, or for lack of company to receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christs Body and Blood; then the Curate shall instruct him, that if he do truly repent of his sins, and stedfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the Cross for him, and shed his Blood for his Redemption, earnestly remembring the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefore,* (without all which, what good will he get by receiving the Sacrament?) *he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his souls health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth.* 2. In the *Rubrick* before the *Communion of the sick*, this Order is given, that the *Curate* having *knowledge over night, or early in the morning*, of the desire of the sick person to receive the *Communion*, and being signified *also how many be appointed to communicate with him, and having a convenient place in the sick mans house, where the Curate may reverently minister, and a good number to receive the Communion with the sick person, with all things necessary for the same, he shall there minister the holy Communion.* Therefore by these *Rubricks*, no *Communion* is to be ministred to the sick, where there be but two to receive it.

Secondly, This is also no way agreeable to *Humanity*. Must a Minister, who hath the charge of many souls, adventure his health, and life, to gratifie an infectious person in that which (as by what hath been before alledged) is no way of necessity to the sick mans salvation? Must the Minister do this, or be punished with *Deprivation*, or otherwise? What cruelty is this? Nay, the very *Canons* of 1603. *Can.*67. provided more mercifully then so; which runs thus: *When any person is dangerously sick in any Parish, the Minister or Curate (having knowledge thereof) shall resort to him or her, (if the Disease be not known, or probably suspected to be infectious) to instruct and comfort them*, &c. Here is a Dispensation in case of the *Plague*, or other *infectious disease*, for so much as *visiting the sick*: and no word at all of giving the *Holy Communion*. So much shall at present suffice to be spoken of the *Rubricks*.

III.

Of the Body of the Book.

1. THe first words of it, (which the Minister is to read) are these: *At what time soever a sinner doth repent him of his sin from the bottom of his heart, I will put all his wickedness out of my remembrance, saith the Lord.* This is (in the *Rubrick* before it) called, *A Sentence of Scripture*: and the place alledged is *Ezek.*21.22. But that Text runs otherwise in the Original, and in the new Translation of the Bible; *viz. But if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful & right, he shall surely live, he shall not die. All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him: in his righteousness that he hath done, he shall live.* Here is little harmony between the *Service-Book* and *Gods Book*: especially considering the very first words in the *Liturgy*, *At what time soever*. Which hath no warrant from that Text, and is dissonant from another, [*To day if ye will hear his voice*, &c.] and from that Application of it, *Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God; but exhort one another dayly, while it is called* To Day, *lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin.* Most men are convinced of the necessity of *repenting*: but, such is the *deceitfulness* of their hearts, that too many defer it, and that upon that very ground expressed in these words, (which have no ground or warrant from the Word of God) *At what time soever a sinner repenteth*,

penteth, &c. as if he could *repent* when he list; which carries many to Hell.

It is true, this is seemingly put off by a great Doctor, thus: *Dixit Dominus quoad sensum, licet non verbatim.* The Book speaks the *sense*, although not the very words of the Text. But this is too frigid an answer to satisfie the Objection. For, 1. It is said to be *a sentence of Scripture*; not an *Exhortation* according to the *sense* onely. It is one thing to give the *sense*, another to repeat the words. 2. This agrees not with the *sense*, but is contrary thereunto, as was but now demonstrated. Therefore it is untrue and injurious to charge the *Apostles* with the like, in alledging the *Old* Testament in the *New*. D. P. de *Discip. Eccl.* 2. 6. Sect. 3.

That expression in the *general Confession of sins*, viz. *There is no health in us*, (although well meant) is incongruous, and improper, because most of the common sort understand not the true meaning of it; yet patter it over, out of custom, without being (through their ignorance) duly sensible of what is indeed intended by it. Howbeit, the *Minister* may not alter the Phrase.

3. After the *first Lesson*, at Morn. Prayer, *Te Deum*, or, *Benedicite*, (both of them, being *Apochrypals*) are to be read before the *second* Lesson; and so they interrupt the *continued reading of the holy Scripture*; which, the *Preface* to that Book would bear us in hand, is provided against.

As for *Te Deum*; or, *We praise thee, O God*, &c. it is a piece taken out of the *Mass-Book*; and in *Popish* Churches usually sung, at times of great Victories, Deliverances, and other Triumphs. From thence, some Bishops (little to their credit) have introduced it, upon like occasions, into *Protestant* Churches: that being no where enjoyned, nor warranted by any Law in force.

This shews what able men such Bishops are to govern, that know not how to express their thanksgiving to God for any extraordinary mercy, so well, as in a superstitious formal dress usually sung in Popish Churches. And, as for *Benedicite*, viz. *O all ye works of the Lord*, &c. it is a piece of the *Mass*-Book also, and taken out of the *Apocryphal song of the three Children*. And it is bungled too; not set forth as it is in the *Song* it self, as by comparing them may appear. And whereas that *Song* is said, in the Title of it, in the *Apocrypha*, to be *the song of the three holy Children which followeth in the third of* Daniel, *after this place*; [*And they walked in the midst of the fire, praising God, and blessing the Lord,*] this is an abusing, and belying of the Canonical Text, in *Daniel* 3. in which there is no hint of any such thing. Yet must this come in, and be kept in, in our *Liturgy* (though, cast out of the *Scotch Book*) to give another lye to the *Preface* of our Book of Common-Prayer; of which, more by and by.

4. The many *Antiphonies* & *Responds* (except the peoples saying, *Amen*)

have no pattern or warrant in the Word. Yet above an hundred of these *Antiphonies* and *Responsals*, or *Answerings* between Minister, Clerk and people, are enjoyned to be used; beside the accompanying of him, in the *Confession of sins*, *Creed*, reading every other verse of the *Psalms*, &c. How can such things (having no warrant in the Word.) be done in Faith, in the Publique Worship of God; and not rather be accounted *Will-Worship?* This is the rather to be excepted against, not onely because it is so frequent in the *Mass*-Books, (but, no where else;) but because also the *Preface* to the Book of Common-Prayer, saith, That *the reading of the holy Scripture is* (therein) *so set forth, that all things shall be done in order, without breaking one piece thereof from another:* and *for this cause, be cut off Antiphonies, Responds, Invitatories, and such like things as did break the continual course of the reading of the Scripture.* How then, do so many *Responds* and Answers of *Clerk* and *People*, while the Minister is reading; as likewise those *Anthems* before-mentioned, which interpose between the first and second *Lesson* (all which are still continued in the *Book*) agree with that *Preface* still printed with the Book?

5. If the *Letany* must be read (which contains petitions for more particulars then all the Book besides; and, being put into one continued prayer, without so many interpositions and interruptions, might be of far better use then now it is) why must the *praying part* be so much performed by the People, and not by the Minister, whose proper Office it is in publique, to pray for the people as their mouth; and not they to be his mouth? There is no ground for this in Scripture: yet we must be made to believe, that there is *nothing* in the *Leiturgy*, but *what is evidently grounded upon the Word.* And wherefore must that clause in the *Letany* [*from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable Enormities*] be still left out? was there no fear of his return to tyrannize over this Land again? Had he ever more Instruments at Work in this Kingdom since the Reformation, then now? If it be said, The Act for *Uniformity* gives notice of an *alteration* in the *Letany:* yet, that *Act* doth not tell us what that is in particular. Therefore, till that *alteration* be named, that clause needeth not, yea ought not, to be omitted, so long as the *Letany* is used.

6. In the Book printed in 1 *Eliz.* there be added (after the *Letany*) two Prayers; one for the then *Queen*, another for *Bishops* (both which were prayed for before, in the *Letany*, and also in the Prayer at the *Communion for the whole estate of Christs Church*) which are not in the Book of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. And, in 1 *Jac.* these were continued, with one other Prayer for Queen *Anne*, the *Prince*, &c. Now, albeit the Prayers for the *King*, *Queen*, and *Royal Family* be useful, and necessary; yet, when the Act of 1. *Eliz.* 2. admits of no alterations from, or additions to that Book in 5. 6. *Ed.* 6. save only in *proper Lessons*

for,

for Sundays, one in the *Letany*, and two more in the *Communion*; and, *none other, or otherwise*; how can those Prayers be used, without making them that use them liable to the Law (if rigorously urged,) till they be confirmed by Act of Parliament; Or rather, till that Act of 1. *Eliz.* 2. be repealed and taken away?

7. Albeit the *Preface* to the Book, saith, that therein, *many things be left out, whereof some be untrue, some uncertain, some vain, and superstitious, and nothing is ordained to be read but the very pure Word of God, the holy Scriptures, or that which is evidently grounded upon the same:* yet are there sundry things more, in the *Body* of that Book, which are neither *certain*, nor *true*, nor *evidently grounded on the Word.* For, to omit the imperfect and corrupt *Translations* mentioned before in the *Sheet* of Paper inserted into this present Book; and, many more, not therein cited, (which shew there is too much, which is not the *very pure Word* of God:) it is too too palpable, that, in the *Prayers*, and *proper Prefaces* for *Christmas* day, and *Whitsunday* (as they are called) there are some things not only *uncertain*, but *false*; yea, impossible to be *true*; and therefore, not *evidently grounded upon the* Word of God. In the Collect or Prayer for *Christmas* day and *seven days after*, we must, in *prayer*, say unto God, that he hath given Christ, *this day (viz. Decemb.* 25.) *to be born of a pure Virgin.* On what Scripture is this (*viz.* that he was born that very day) *evidently grounded?* and, if it did so appear; how can we say the same (without manifest and gross lying unto God) seven other days more, one after another, seeing he was born but once, and on one day onely? The like must be said of the *proper Preface*, for that Day; of which before, in the *Rubricks.* Such also is the Collect for *Whitsunday*, which begins thus: *God which as upon this day*, &c. And, more clearly, in the *Proper Preface*, it is said, *the Holy Ghost came down this day from heaven*, &c. And this must be said not only on that day, but on *six days after.* Can this be true, when he came down in that manner, but once? And, when that day was, is very *uncertain*; especially with us, with whom *Whitsunday* is a *Moveable Feast*, falling out (as *Lent*, and *Easter* do) some years in one month; some, in another; but never on the same day of the same month, two years together. What horrible abusing of God, and that in very Prayers, is this?

8. After the *Proper Prefaces* at the Communion, followeth this: *Therefore with Angels, and Archangels, and with all the Company of heaven, we laud and magnifie thy glorious Name*, &c. Here is another *uncertainty* (to say nothing of the *untruth* of it;) for the Scripture never speaks of more *Archangels* then one: which is mentioned, 1 *Thes.* 4. 16. This one, was *Michael*, *Jude* 12. to wit, Christ, the *Prince* of his people, *Dan.* 10. 21. which most, if not all, expound of *Christ*: Even Him who is mentioned in *Revel.* 12. 7. where it is said, There

was

was war in heaven, Michael and his Angels fought against the Dragon, and the Dragon fought and his Angels, and prevailed not, &c. It is true, that the ſuppoſititious *Dionyſius Areopagita*, takes upon him, in his *Celeſtial Hierarchy*, to divide the Angels into three ſeveral *Hierarchies*: but, *Quo warranto*, further then his own bare word, he doth not at all ſo much as propound; only he pretendeth to take it from *Epheſ.* 6. 12. *Col.* 1. 16. (of which interpretations, ſee *Zanch.* in *Epheſ.*) that expoſition being a meer dream.

9. In one of the *Prayers* after the *Communion*, it is prayed, that *thoſe things which for our unworthineſs we dare not, and for our blindneſs, we cannot ask, vouchſafe to give us*, &c. This is a *Contradiction*: for, while we ſay *we dare not ask*, we do *ask*, and pray him *to give us*. Can we pray thus in faith? Yes, you will ſay, when we pray for this, for *the worthineſs of Chriſt*, as after followeth. But then take this Reply. If our own *unworthineſs* cauſeth us not to *dare to ask*, why do we pray elſewhere, for ought elſe at all? It is not mans *worthineſs*, but Gods *promiſe* (2 *Sam.* 7. 18, 19. and *ver.* 25, 26, 27. and *Pſal.* 119. 49) but eſpecially Chriſts warrant and command (*Joh.* 16. 23, 24.) that gives us boldneſs, to *dare to ask* whatſoever we need.

10. In the ſecond Prayer at *publique Baptiſm*, we pray, *that Infants coming to Baptiſm, may receive remiſſion of their ſins by ſpiritual regeneration*. How can this be? it is true, *Remiſſion of ſins* and *regeneration*, flow from one and the ſame fountain, and are both conveyed and *ſealed* in Baptiſm, *ſeminally* at leaſt, to thoſe within the Covenant by the ſame *Spirit*. But *remiſſion of ſins* is not *received* by, or from *ſpiritual Regeneration*, but by, and from the *bloud of Chriſt*. For, *without ſhedding of bloud there is no remiſſion*, Heb. 9. 22. that is to ſay, *the bloud of Jeſus Chriſt cleanſeth us* (in reſpect of guilt) *from all ſin*, 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. It is not then by the grace of *regeneration* wrought in us, but by the bloud of Chriſt ſhed for us, that we *receive remiſſion of ſins*. Away then with that expreſſion in Baptiſm; unleſs we be more for mans falſhood, then for Gods Truth.

11. All that is in the *Catechiſm*, touching the *Sacraments*, was (contrary to the *Act* of 1. *Eliz.* 2.) added in King *James* his Reign, but never confirmed by Parliament, therefore not ſafely to be uſed, although ſomewhat in that kind be uſeful and neceſſary: yet not that model. The *Anſwer* to the firſt *Queſtion* [*viz.* to that, *How many Sacraments hath Chriſt ordained in his Church?*] is this, *Two only as generally neceſſary to ſalvation*: which *Anſwer* is very dubious, and liable to exception. For it may (without racking) be interpreted as a tacite admiſſion of more (as *Marriage*, *Holy Orders*, &c.] though not *generally neceſſary* for all. Again, where it is demanded, *why are Infants baptized, when by reaſon of their tender age they cannot perform them?* that is, they cannot *repent*, nor *believe* [which the *Anſwer* to

the

the next preceding *Questions*, admits to be required *of persons that are to be baptized*] the *Answer* is this: *Yes, they do perform them by their Sureties*, &c. which is a meer tale. For, however the *Sureties promise*, and engage for these, in behalf of the infant; and, upon that account, a charge (after *Baptism*) is given to the *Sureties*, to *take care that the Infant, so soon as he is able to learn, be taught* what he by them, *vowed in* Baptism, and what further is required of him: yet it was never read or heard of in Scripture, that one man either *repented*, or *believed* in the name and room of another, whereby that other did receive all or any of the spiritual benefits, exhibited and sealed in either of the Sacraments to such as are admitted to them. And to say, the Infants *perform* (*repentance* and *believing*) by their *Sureties*, because the *Sureties vow them both in the Infants names*, is a strange and untrue expression: for it is not *vowing* by one, that another shall *repent*, and believe, when he is not at present able to do either, that can truely be said, to be a performing of them, by him that makes that vow; supposing him to be a true *believer*, which many Sureties be not.

12. In the *Commination* appointed and *enjoyned* by the *Rubrick* before it, to be used *divers times in the year*, (however a learned Doctor would shift off the objection against it, by saying, *Non tam exigitur quam consulitur:*) there is a *service* set up, which, however it was appointed by God to be once used by the children of Israel so soon as they *were gone over Jordan* into *Canaan*, Deut. 27. yet is now no way warrantable in the Publique Worship of God: that is, for the Minister openly to denounce Curses upon all sinners, *divers times in the year*; and that, not in the ordinary *Reading-place*, but *out of the Pulpit:* To which, *all the people are required to say, Amen:* Whereby many of them are necessitated to curse themselves. But, as for that place in *Deuteronomy*, that is no warrant for this, now; Because, that was no part of the *Publique Service* then incumbent on the *Priests*, or *Levites*, nor to be done by any in the place of Publique Worship: but upon Mount *Ebal:* and that by six of the *Tribes*, to wit, *Reuben, Gad, Asher, Zebulun, Dan and Naphtali*, ver. 13. and that, but once. And let it be observed, that *Levi* was none of them that were appointed to *Curse*; nor were they of that Tribe, so much as among them. But he was to be upon *Mount Gerizzim*, with *Simeon, Judah, Issachar, Joseph and Benjamin*, to *bless*, ver. 12. And this was the charge before given of God by *Moses* unto *Aaron and his sons*, (as their constant duty at all publique Assemblies of the Congregation for *Worship*) Numb. 6. 23, &c. to bless the Congregation, thus: *The Lord bless thee, and keep thee; the Lord make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.* This indeed was an Ordinance, to which God there promiseth a *good* success, saying; *They shall put my Name upon the children of Israel,*

Israel, and I will bless them. For Ministers of the Gospel then, whose Office it is to be Messengers of Peace, and to *bring glad tidings of good things to his people*; to be imployed, and that often, in *cursing* the people as a part of his Office and of publique Worship, (not this or that particular offender, being according to Christs Ordinance convicted, and censured, and still remaining refractory and impenitent:) is such a piece of humane and unchristian-like invention, as hath no warrant from the Word of God, nor from the practise of the *Primitive Church*, which this very *Commination* it self, in the first lines of it plainly confesseth, where it saith that, then the *Discipline* was, to put *notorious sinners* to *open penance*, in *Lent*: and that, *in stead thereof, until the said Discipline may be restored, it is thought good*, to use this. Which shews plainly, that this is no other then a later spawn of Antichrist in his Popish Services. More might be said of sundry other particulars in the *Service-Book*: but we suppose that he that shall duly weigh that which hath been already noted, will think these enow.

III.

Of RITES and CEREMONIES.

HAving spoken of the necessity of Reformation in *Worship*, it is necessary, in the next place, to shew the like necessity of *Reformation in Rites and Ceremonies*, which are appurtenances of, and appendents to *Worship*, in relation to the Injunctions of the Apostle, *Let all things be done decently and in order* a; and, *to the use of edifying* b.

a 1 Cor. 14. 40.

b 1 Cor. 14. 26.

And here we speak not of *Rites* and *Ceremonies*, which be *Divine*, by Gods own *Institution*; for these are all, in some respects, parts of external Divine Worship, in their use, prescribed by himself (such are, the *outward elements* in the *Sacraments*, &c.) and, in other respects, *Ceremonies* appendent to that Worship, which is internal, and principally intended in and by that which is external by Divine Institution.

But we speak of *Rites* and *Ceremonies*, appointed by the Lights and Guides of the Church, for *decency*, *order* and *edification*; being of *Humane* institution, and alterable, although used in the exercise of *Religious Worship*: according to the 34th *Article* of Religion, which teacheth that *it is not* necessary *that Ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly*

utterly like; for, at all times they have been divers, and may be changed, according to the diversities of Countries, Times, and Mens manners, &c.

The reasons why such *Ceremonies* not only may, but sometimes must be *changed, according to the diversities of Countries, Times, and Mens manners,* (which may make it evident that what is now desired, no way tendeth to disorder, confusion, or *Schism*; but, to godly order, without the least infringement of holy *unity* in the Church) are plainly set forth before the *Book of Common-prayer* it self, under that *Preface*, or Title; *Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained.* Where it is said, *Of such Ceremonies as be used in the Church, and have had their beginning by the institution of man; some, at the first, were of godly intent and purpose devised, and yet at length turned to vanity and superstition; some entred into the Church by indiscret Devotion, and such a zeal as was without knowledge; and for because they were winked at in the beginning, they grew daily to more and more abuses, which not only for their unprofitableness, but because they have much blinded the people, and obscured the glory of God, are worthy to be cut away, and clean rejected.*

The same *Preface* saith further, *Some are put away, because the great excess and multitude of them hath so increased in these later days, that the burden of them was intolerable: whereof St.* Augustine *in his time complained, that they were grown to such a number, that the estate of Christian people was in worse case concerning that matter, then were the Jews. And he counselled that such yoke and burthen should be taken away, as time would serve quietly to do it. But what would St.* Augustine *have said, if he had seen the Ceremonies of late days used among us, whereunto the multitude used in his time was not to be compared? This our excessive multitude of Ceremonies was so great, and many of them so dark, that they did more confound and darken, then declare and set forth Christs benefits unto us.*

Upon these and other reasons it was, that many *Ceremonies* introduced into the *Mass-Books* and other Popish *Breviaries*, such as, *ducking* and *bowing* to the *East*, to the Altar, the standing up at *Gloria Patri*, or *Glory be to the Father*, &c. at the *reading of the Gospels* of the Day, the wearing of *Robes, Copes, Lawn sleeves*, or other *Vestments*, (save onely a *Rochet* to be worn by an *Archbishop*, or *Bishop*, and *Surplice only* by *Priests* and *Deacons*;) the wearing of *Sandals* or *Slippers*, when men go into *Churches* or *Chappels*; the *turning Communion Tables*, and setting them *Altar-wise* (at the *East* end of the *Chancel*, or setting up *Altars* of stone in that place, whether the Congregation can hear or not:) womens wearing of *Vails*, and offering of *Chrisomes* at *Churchings*, and that at the *high Altar*; the reading of the *Lessons* in one place, and the *second Service*, at the *Altar*; which *second Service*

was never appointed by the *Common-prayer-book* to be used but onely at the celebration of the *Lords Supper:* the setting up of *Tapers of wax, Candlesticks, Basons* and *Ewres*, upon the high *Altar*, and ducking to them every time a man comes into the Church or goes out, or stirs, while he is in it: (Whereas *Cups, Pots and Basons* for Alms, were never since 5. *Edw.* 6. to be set there, but at the *Communion*; nor then, to be bowed unto, though the Bread and Wine were on the Table;) The wearing of *Hoods* of degrees, and many other such like devices, all which were laid aside in 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. as appears by the *Rubricks*, and the *Act* for Uniformity in 1. *Eliz.* 2. compared together, which allows nothing but what was in the *Book* of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. save onely the *alterations* mentioned in the said Act, as hath been before shewed. And, however the Rubrick before the Book printed in 1. *Eliz.* directeth to use such Ornaments as were in use in 2. *Edw.* 6. yet that is no part of the Book established: because the Book of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. hath no such *Rubrick*; and the *Act* enjoyns all to be done according to that Book, *and none other, or otherwise.* However, afterwards, another Statute of Q. *Eliz.* did so appoint.

Now, the same *Preface* before the *Common-prayer*, touching Ceremonies, giveth all men to understand, that *the most weighty cause of the abolishing of certain Ceremonies, was, that they were so far abused partly by the Superstitious blindness of the rude and unlearned, and partly by the insatiable avarice of such as sought more their own lucre, then the glory of God, that the abuses could not well be taken away, the thing remaining still.* Upon which grounds, there was a removal of them in 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. For then, was that *Preface* of *Ceremonies* first prefixed to the *Book of Common-prayer.*

But so great is the itch of mans corrupt nature after *Humane* inventions in *Divine* Worship, and so natural are Popish Gue-gaws and outward pompous toyes that please the senses, that many of these (who had been laid aside, as aboveſaid, in 5. 6. *Edw.* 6.) and that, at the Conference at *Hampton-court*, it was desired that those Ceremonies and Rites of the *Cross in Baptism, kneeling at the Communion*, the *Surplice*, &c. might be put away; yet such was the violence of the prevailing party at that time; that, having obtained License under the Great Seal, they in *Convocation, An.* 1603. recalled sundry of those rejected *Ceremonies* again; and enjoyned all Students in Colleges to wear *Surplices* in time of *Divine service*, Can. 17. *Copes* by him that Ministreth the Sacrament; *Epistolers* and *Gospelers*, according to 7. *Eliz.* (there being no such Statute, nor *Parliament* in 7. *Eliz.*) and sundry other things: under colour whereof, by degrees, most of those things before cast out, *viz.* bowing to the East, and to the *Altar*, with the rest before named, were retroduced; and now devoutly (or rather superstitiously) observed, without any shew or co-

colour of warrant, but *ancient* custom, which being, duly examined, will appear to all to be first used in the Popish Churches, as too palpably appeareth by the *Preface* touching *Ceremonies* before alledged.

Yea, those very men who are so much for these; and not onely urge the 18th *Canon* of 1603. but the *Queens Injunctions* * for *bowing at the Name of Jesus*, which no Common-prayer-book, or Statute hath enjoyned; yet, in other things, regard not those *Injunctions*, nor the *Book of Homilies*; no, nor the *Act for Uniformity* it self touching such *Ceremonies* as they have a mind to recal and advance: witness their setting up *Candles* in *Candlesticks* on the *High Altar* (as they call it) and such like superstitions which the third *Injunction* of *Eliz.* reckons among those things which *tend to Idolatry and Superstition, which of all other offences God doth most detest and abhor.* They must have their *Antiphonies, Responds*, &c. which the *Preface* to the Common-prayer-book, tells us are laid aside, &c. Not content with this, they must have all (except Candles lighted) that are upon the Popish Altars where *Mass* is used, upon their high Altars; yea, *piping* on divers Instruments, *singing* (so as none can understand the *matter*, but onely be tickled with the *musick*) *playing upon Organs*, &c. all which were laid aside in *Edw.* 6. and even by the 2 *Hom.* of the *Place and time of Prayer*, (which is by vertue of *Art.* 35. subscribed unto by every Minister in *England* that ever was admitted to any Ecclesiastical Promotion, according to the Act of 13. *Eliz.* 12.) are censured and declared openly to all, to be *displeasing unto God, and sore and filthily to defile his holy House and Place of Prayer.* All which are here mentioned, to shew how far they deviate, and whither they are tending and posting amain, who under colour of upholding, and practising of the laudable Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of *England*, do recal and retroduce many Popish *Rites* cast out of this Church, and despise all Laws and Constitutions made against them; and are thereby lyable to Inditements every time they use them, upon the Statute of 1 *Eliz.* 2. We shall forbear to insist longer upon this, but leave it to others to judge what sad and dangerous effects, these things (if they be suffered and countenanced) are likely to produce.

* 52 *Injunct.*

That which we chiefly aim at, is, to shew a *necessity* of reforming those *Rites and Ceremonies* contained in the Book of *Common-Prayer*, or enjoyned by the *Canons* of 1603. Such are, the *Surplice, Copes*, &c. enjoyned to be used by Ministers; the *Cross* in Baptism, *Kneeling* at the Communion, *Marriage* with the *Ring*, *Bowing* at the *Name of Jesus*, and such like, imposed upon all, as established by Law. But, such Establishment, we do, and must deny, until we see a *Record* produced, by which that Book now in use, or printed in 1 *Eliz.* is by Act of Parliament, ratified and confirmed. For if either there be no *Record*, of that, to which an Act referreth, or that there be more alterations in

the Book said to be eſtabliſhed, than the *Act* mentioneth; can that Book be properly ſaid to be eſtabliſhed by Law, and not rather made void thereby? In all other things, nothing is admitted for Law, or as being of force by Law, but what is expreſſly contained *in verbis*, in the Act it ſelf; eſpecially, if the Act refer to any thing to be confirmed by it, of which no Record can be produced, and which differs from ought elſe that is ſaid to be ratified by it. And this is the caſe of the preſent *Liturgy*, which neither is *Recorded*, nor agreeth with, but hath ſundry alterations from, and additions to that of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. beſides thoſe hinted in the *Act* of 1 *Eliz.* 2. And if any *Deed* or *Bond* be raſed, or altered after ſealing; or, if raſed, or altered before ſealing, and that not witneſſed; will ſuch a *Deed* or *Bond* be admitted as good evidence at Law, or in Equity, if produced and pleaded? We therefore cannot underſtand how the preſent Service-Book can be eſtabliſhed by Law, it being no where Recorded; and, in ſundry things, (beſide thoſe mentioned in the Statute of 1 *Eliz.* 2.) varying from that which was once Recorded, as hath been before demonſtrated. To ſay, the Book, in what remaineth, ſtill bindeth, *in tanto* at leaſt, is but a miſtake: for, any Record, or *Deed*, vitiated in any one part, makes void the whole, in Law.

And as for thoſe *Rites* enjoyned in the Book of *Canons*, we ſhall forbear to ſpeak of the Legality of them, till we come to ſhew the neceſſity of *Reformation* in *Diſcipline*, a great part whereof is contained in that Book.

Nor is it our purpoſe to inſiſt upon the *unlawfulneſs* of thoſe *Ceremonies*, ſo as to make any diſpute thereupon, nor to juſtifie or condemn thoſe who hold them ſimply unlawful in themſelves. But we, taking it for granted that they are in themſelves ἀδιάφορα, or *things indifferent*, do humbly pray that theſe things may be duely conſidered, in the general:

1. That being ſuch, they ought not to be impoſed on thoſe, who cannot be *fully perſwaded in their own minds* and Conſciences that they are lawful, and therefore muſt ſin, if they uſe them. This is St. *Paul*'s own Doctrine and Practiſe touching things of this nature, notwithſtanding his own judgement of the lawfulneſs of them. In his days, many godly Chriſtians, both in *Rome*, *Corinth*, and elſewhere, made ſcruple of ſundry *meats* forbidden in the Levitical Law, and of omitting *days* enjoyned by it. Others, ſatisfied of the lawfulneſs of both, did eat thoſe *meats*, and omit thoſe *days*; at which others were ſcandalized: ſome, by adventuring through other mens example, to do the like, albeit they were not fully ſatisfied of the lawfulneſs thereof, and thereby *ſinned*: others took offence, and were grieved, and thereupon cenſured all that uſed their Chriſtian Liberty in thoſe things of which they that uſed it, were fully ſatisfied: and hereupon, the *weak*, for

cenſuring,

censuring, sinned also: and, by both these, the *weak* were in danger to be *destroyed*, Rom. 14.15.

Now, what was our *Apostles Doctrine*, and *Practise* herein? His *Doctrine* was this: *I know, and am perswaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of it self: but to him that esteemeth any thing unclean, to him it is unclean*, Rom. 14.15. And, *All things indeed are pure; but, it is evil for that man who eateth with offence. It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is made weak*, vers. 20, 21. His *Practise* was this: 1. Touching himself; *If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend*, 1 Cor. 8.13. And, as toward others, he straitly chargeth on all, these two things: 1. To take heed lest by any *means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to them that are weak*, ibid. vers. 9. that is, by using that Liberty before others not satisfied in the lawfulness of it. 2. If the one will yet *use this liberty*, and the other will *take offence*, then, his charge is, *Let not him that eateth, despise him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth*, Rom. 14.3. But, as for enjoyning the *eating* of what himself held to be lawful, on those that doubted the lawfulness of it, (although he had more Authority then all our Bishops and Clergy in *Convocation*, to make Canons) we never find that he did it; but, warned and forbade all the very use of it, before any that, through weakness, took offence at it. If then, Authority will follow the Apostles rule, they will find a necessity, not onely of taking off all Impositions already made, but the taking away of all the things so imposed, at which so many able and godly peaceable Ministers and People do take offence; and, for which, so many thousands have deeply suffered, to avoid sinning against God by conforming to them. *For, whatsoever is not of faith, is sin.*

2. If it be said, The instances last given concern onely private things, and private practises; what is this to Publick Order in the House of God, where the *Service and Worship of Almighty God, by the Hedge of Ceremonies is preserved from lying open to all profaneness*; as a confident stickler for *Ceremonies*, groundlesly pretendeth? To this, it is answered, That Ceremonies are no such *Hedge*; unless to keep out such as have as good right to the Ordinances as they who do impose them, (for which they must one day give a sad account;) and, that it is much more dangerous and sinful to enjoyn things of this nature for Publick use in the Administration of Publick Ordinances. Because, those private *meats*, &c. may be avoided by such as take offence at them; for, what necessity, to be present at the use of them? But, there is a necessity of being present at the other: which he that neglecteth, is lyable to punishment by the Law. The Law tyeth all to come to the Common Service, every Sunday, and Holy-day; to receive the

Holy

Holy Communion thrice at least in every year: and, imposeth a sharp penalty for neglect hereof. So that, while these are imposed, or used, (where weak Christians take offence at them) many godly men are forced to offend, either against God, by submitting to that they are not satisfied in the lawfulness of it; or, against the Laws of the Land, by not conforming to them, which they cannot do without sin. So that the *imposing* of them upon all, or the *using* of them before all, who cannot, without sin, submit to them, is the abusing of Authority, and the making it to sin against *Christ*, by putting it upon the forcing *those for whom Christ died, to sin* against their own Consciences, and to drive them on to *destruction* in Hell, as a man would force a Beast into the water, or fire that will surely devour him. It is then a groundless *put off*, to say, that such things *being commanded by just Authority, the indifference by that command determineth, and they become necessary:* which is quite contrary to the Apostles rule.

3. If these be retained in some places where no offence is taken at them: yet there is no reason to impose, or use them in other places where any are offended at them. For, 1. to plead Imposition for order and unity in the Church of *England*, is to no purpose; because there is no necessity of the same, in all places, no more then of all the same Orders and Practises in all *Corporations* in *England*; and, of every *Company* within those Corporations (who all have different Orders and Rules) to preserve Order and Unity in the Civil Government of the Kingdom. 2. Our very Articles of Religion, (as hath been shewed) say, That *it is not necessary that Ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed, according to the diversities of Countries, times, and mens manners.* Art. 34. 3. If it be said, These refer to *different Countries*; not to different *places* within the *same Country:* It is answered, that *times, and mens manners*, must produce a Change, where ever a removal of those in being, is necessary, as appears by the Article. And where things of this nature, that *at first were of godly intent and purpose devised, but at length turned into vanity and superstition*; by the Preface touching *Ceremonies*, (before cited) they are adjudged *worthy to be cut away, and clean rejected:* and so many of them have already been, (as was the *Brasen* Altar by *Hezekiah.*) And it further telleth us, that *as those be taken away which were most abused, and burdened mens consciences without any cause:* so the *other that remain may (upon just causes) be altered and changed.* So that here is nothing desired, in the taking away the imposition, yea, all *use* of them, but according to Law.

4. The Book of Common-Prayer of 2 *Edw.* 6. is in some things referred to, and particularly as to *Ornaments* and Rites, both by the *Rubrick* before *Morning-Prayer* in the present Liturgy; and, by the Stat. of 1 *Eliz.* 2. So that, as to this point, so much of that first Book is

still

ſtill in force by Law. But, that Book hath expreſly given a liberty in ſome of the things here deſired to be no further impoſed, where (in the laſt Page thereof, called, *Certain Notes for the more plain Explication, and decent Miniſtration, of things contained therein*) it ſaith, *As touching kneeling, croſſing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breaſt, and other geſtures, they may be uſed or left, as every mans devotion ſerveth, without blame.* This is ſtill good Law. So that whatever is enjoyned in the Canons for the impoſing this, is void in Law by the Stat. of 25. *H.* 8. 19. (although made by the Kings *Licence* and *Aſſent*) becauſe contrary to that Law of 1 *Eliz.* 2. in this particular.

Now, if the Law it ſelf give a Liberty in ſome; we truſt that, upon the foregoing Reaſons, our *Law-givers* will take off the impoſition of the reſt, if not wholly remove them.

5. The Biſhops themſelves take Liberty to omit one Ornament impoſed on them to be uſed: namely, the *Paſtoral Staff*, which in the ſame place of the Book of 2. *Edw.* 6. he is enjoyned to *have in his hand, or to have it born by his Chaplain*; and this is not left Arbitrary, as the Rites laſt before named, are: yet the Biſhops herein can diſpenſe for themſelves: is there not reaſon then to diſpenſe with Miniſters in the reſt?

Having thus pleaded the neceſſity of Reformation in *Rites and Ceremonies* (but eſpecially of providing againſt the Impoſition of any of them) in general; we ſhall not enter into any debate of the particulars: for, of that there is no need in this place. But, becauſe we are ſubject to be upbraided, that many of us have both ſubſcribed to uſe all thoſe, contained in the Liturgy; and, ſome of us have accordingly uſed them: and that therefore we are Revolters from our *Subſcription*, and thereby lyable to the penalty of *Excommunication*, by the ſixth *Canon*: It behoves us to make this Apology for our ſelves. 1. That albeit ſome of us have unadviſedly ſubſcribed to uſe them, and perhaps have uſed them ſometimes; yet finding that many ſober Chriſtians are ſcandalized at them, we hold our ſelves bound to imitate the Apoſtle; and, what he did in the Caſe of *meat* (which he held to be lawful) we muſt do, in the Caſe of *Ceremonies*; to uſe them no more *while the world ſtandeth, rather then make our brother to offend.* 2. As to the danger incurred thereby, we muſt not ſo much ſtand upon that, as to *chuſe iniquity rather then affliction.* 3. And as touching the validity and force of the *Canon*, we fear it not, it being void in Law: of which we ſhall ſpeak more under the head of *Diſcipline*.

IIII.

Of CHURCH-GOVERNMENT.

BY *Church-Government* is meant the *Eccleſiaſtcal* Government of the Church of *England*, ſaid, and commonly reputed to be eſtabliſhed by the Laws of the Realm. For, however ſome have of late pretended to a *Jus Divinum*, or Divine Inſtitution of *Epiſcopacy*, of late years uſed in *England*; yet the Laws of the Kingdom would never own any ſuch thing, nor ſuffer them to exerciſe any power, but what the *Municipal* Laws Authorize them unto. Yea, *the Statute of Proviſors*, 25th of *Edw.*3. *An.* 1350. Declareth plainly that *Prelacy* it ſelf was erected in *England* by the *Kings* of *England*, and not by any other Authority. For that Statute begins thus: *Whereas late in the Parliament of good memory of* Edward *King of* England, *Grandfather to our Lord the King that now is, the five and twentieth year of his Reign, holden at* Carlile, *the Petition heard, put before the ſaid Grandfather and his Counſel in his ſaid Parliament by the Comminalty of the ſaid Realm, containing; That whereas the Holy Church of* England *was* FOUNDED IN THE ESTATE OF PRELACIE *within the Realm of* England *by the ſaid Grandfather, and his Progenitors, and the Earls, and other Nobles of his ſaid Realm, and their Anceſtors, to inform them and the people of the Law of God*, &c. Therefore, we cannot look upon ſuch Biſhops in any other Capacity, in *England*. And, according hereunto, take notice, under this Head of *Church-government*, 1. Of their *Conſtitution* by *Conſecration*; 2. Of their *Juriſdiction*, by *Delegation* of his Majeſty according to his Laws. 3. Of their *Execution* of *Diſcipline* accordingly. By their *Conſecration*, they have a power of *Ordination*. By their *Juriſdiction*, they have a power to *Govern*. And, by their *Execution* of that Office, they have a power of *Diſcipline*. But, all theſe, according to the Laws of the Land; and none other, or otherwiſe. We ſhall therefore ſpeak ſomewhat to each of theſe, and humbly offer Reaſons of the *neceſſity* of *reforming* Epiſcopacy and Church-government, in every one of theſe.

I.

Of the Consecration *of Bishops, and their power of* Ordination *thereupon.*

"1. BY the Laws of the Land, after the death of any Bishop, his "Majesty useth to send out his Writ of *Conge d' Eslier*, to "the Dean and Chapter to Elect another. Which Election being "made, signified under the Chapter-Seal, and confirmed by the Roy- "al Assent; the King sendeth out his *Mandate* to the Archbishop of "the Province, to proceed to *Consecration* (of the person so elected) "or *Confirmation* (if *consecrated* before, and now but *Translated* from "one *See* to another) as the case may vary. So is it acknowledged by one that takes on him to know more than many others of this particular. But, whereas he addeth, that *thereupon it must needs be, that when the Church comes to such a condition* (that is, to be without *Archbishops* and *Deans and Chapters*; of both which the same Author saith, the late King was content (in the *Confer.* at the *Isle of Wight*) to grant an abolition;)&, that this was acknowledged on all sides *that where there is no* Dean and Chapter *to Elect*, and *no* Archbishop *to* Consecrate, and Confirm *the Person elected*; *there can be legally, and regularly no succession of Bishops:* There is no necessity of such a Consequence, nor of making more *Archbishops*, or *Deans and Chapters*, or continuing of any such, if it shall please the King and Parliament, by any *Act* or *Statute* to appoint any other way and course of *Election* and *Consecration* of Bishops. Which is as easie to be done, as any thing else Enacted *in* Parliament; there being no Divine Right so much as pretended unto, for such *Election*, or *Consecration* as of late was used in *England*.

Dr. Heylin, *Advertis. on* Hist. *of K.* Charles, *p.* 193.

2. Whereas it is of late much insisted upon, that *Episcopacy* is not only an Office of *Precedency* and *Presidency* above other *Presbyters* and *Ministers*, given to them by the free Election of the rest; to regulate, order, and act things agreed upon by the Presbytery joyned with them, as the *Commander* in chief in an *Army*, as the *Capital Justice* in a *Court*, or as the *Speaker* in either House of Parliament; but that it is a distinct and specifical Order (by *Divine Right*) Superiour to all other Presbyters, which Order onely, is Authorized to exercise such things as none else may medle with: We say, that this in *England* was never at all arrogated by any Bishops, till of very late times. 2. The things they make peculiar to Bishops, *ratione Ordinis*, are, *sole Ordina-*

tion, and *ſole Juriſdiction*; as if none had power in either of theſe but themſelves: neither of which, even they who pretend to derive their *Epiſcopacy* from the Apoſtles, ever undertook to make good by any ſolid Antiquity. Yea, 3. thoſe very Antiquities which they allege, are either ſpurious, or elſe ſpeak nothing either of *ſole Ordination*, or of *ſole Juriſdiction*; but rather, the contrary; as might eaſily be made out. But, we tye our ſelves to ſpeak to theſe particulars only, as ſaid to be made out by Law.

3. This was never yielded by any Law of *England*; nor, by the Book of *Ordination*. For, however that Book eſtabliſhed in 5.6. *Edw.* 6. and (after repeal by Queen *Mary*) confirmed in 8. *Eliz.* cap. 1. Yet when it ſpeaks of the making of *Biſhops*, it calls that a *Conſecration*, and not an *Ordination*; as it doth, when it ſpeaks of making *Deacons*, and *Presbyters*, which it calleth *Prieſts*: calling one, *The form and manner of Ordering Deacons*; the other, *The form of Ordering* Prieſts. But when it ſpeaks of the other, it changeth this Word *Ordering*, and calls it, The form of *Conſecrating an Archbiſhop, or Biſhop*. Which ſhews plainly, that the Book of *Ordination* never meant to make Biſhops, or (as Dr. *Gauden* calls it) *Legal Epiſcopacy*, to be not only in *Degree*, and Office of *Prolocutor*, but in a diſtinct *Order*, of Chriſt's and his Apoſtles inſtitution, Superiour to a *Presbyter*. It is indeed an eaſie matter for a bold man to contradict this; and, to ſay, that *the antient Writers call the Solemn form of conſecrating a Biſhop by no other name then that of Ordinatio Epiſcopi*: but, it ſeems, it is not ſo eaſie to prove what he ſaith. For he produceth no ſuch proof at all: ſo that this confident ſaying touching ſuch *Ordination* of Biſhops (affirmed by his Adverſary to be a *Novel Popiſh Poſition*) that this [*Not Novel, he is ſure*] is but a meer ſhift, and a put off, no confutation at all. And, where he is pleaſed afterwards to urge the *Preface* to the Book of *Ordination*, which mentioneth, *three Orders of Miniſters in the Church*; *Biſhops*, *Prieſts and Deacons*; and, one paſſage in one of the *Prayers*, at the *Conſecration* of an *Archbiſhop* or *Biſhop*, to prove that Epiſcopacy is a diſtinct *Order* from, and Superiour to that of *Presbyters*: he muſt be intreated to take notice, 1. That the *Preface* alleged ſaith not (as he ſpeaks) *theſe THREE Orders*; but, onely, *theſe Orders of Miniſters*, &c. But even there, by way of explanation, the *Preface* calls them *Offices*, [*which Offices were evermore had in ſuch reverent eſtimation*, &c.] now we deny them not to be diſtinct *Offices*; only we cannot admit, in his ſenſe, the *Office* of a Biſhop to be a diſtinct *Order*, above *Presbytery*. For, even, in that very *Preface*, it ſpeaks of *Conſecrating*, not of *Ordaining* a Biſhop, as the Book all along doth of *Ordering*, that is, *Ordaining* of *Deacons* and *Prieſts*: but never of other then of *Conſecrating* of *Archbiſhops* and *Biſhops*, that is, of ſetting them over the reſt in degree

Dr *Heylin* Certam. Epiſtol. p. 143.

degree, to be the mouth and hand of the rest, in executing what by the rest is agreed upon. And 2. touching that *Prayer* he mentions, wherein *Episcopacy* is called, in that Part of the Book it self which concerneth *Bishops, an Order:* This is but a wyre-drawing of the Words, and a meer wresting of them. The Words of the Prayer are these, *Almighty God, giver of all good things, which by thy holy Spirit hast appointed divers Orders of Ministers in thy Church, mercifully behold this thy Servant, now called to the Work and Ministry of a Bishop,* &c. Now, how do these words prove a Bishop to be a distinct *Order*, when speaking of the person then to be made Bishop, it is not said, he is called to the *Order*, but to the *Work* and *Ministry of a Bishop?* And seeing he onely talks of *antient Writers*, but produceth none, we shall make bold to mind him what is the sense of the *Canon-Law* (which he pleads to be still in force in *England*) if *Lindwood* (that great English Canonist) be of any value with him; who saith expresly, *Episcopatus non est Ordo.* Yea, the very Book of *Ordination*, in ordering of *Priests*, appointing 1 *Tim.* 3. to be then read [*If any desire the Office of a Bishop, he desireth an honest work. A Bishop must be blameless*, &c.] doth more then tacitly admit a Bishop and a Presbyter not to differ in Order. To which we shall add the judgement of an antient Archbishop of *Canterbury*, even *Anselmus* himself (an high man for the Pope, and a great Contestor with the King for Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, even beyond the bounds of the Laws of this Land) who in his *Commentary* on the *Epistle* to the *Philippians*, where *Paul*, cap. 1. saluteth but two Orders, *Bishops and Deacons*, on the word *Episcopis*, saith thus: *Episcopis, id est, Presbyteris*----*Episcopos namque pro Presbyteris more suo posuit. Non enim plures Episcopi in una civitate erant, neque Presbyteros intermitteret, ut ad Diaconos descenderet. Sed dignitatem & excellentiam Presbyterorum declarat, dum eosdem qui Presbyteri sunt, Episcopos esse manifestat. Quod autem postea unus electus est, qui cæteris præponeretur, in Schismatis remedio factum est, ne unusquisque ad se trahens Evangelium, rumperet. Nam est* Alexandriæ *a* Marco *Evangelista usque ad* Heraclam, *&* Dionysium *Episcopos (qui sederunt in Centuria 3.) Presbyterum unum de se electum, & in Excelsiori loco &* Gradu *collocatum Episcopum nominabant, quomodo si Exercitus, Imperatorem faciat, aut Diaconi elegant de se, quem industrium noverint, & Archidiaconum vocent. Constat ergo* APOSTOLICA INSTITUTIONE, *omnes Presbyteros esse Episcopos, licet nunc illi majores hoc nomen obtineant. Episcopus enim* Superintendens *dicitur: & omnis Presbyter debet intendere curam super oves sibi commissas.* For brevity sake we forbear to English this long allegation. The sum of it is, that in the Primitive Church, *Bishops* and *Presbyters* were one, in respect of *Order*; however, a Bishop chosen by the Presbytery were over them in respect of *place* and *degree*.

4. *Biſhops*, being *Conſecrated*, have power by the *Stat.* of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. and 8. *Eliz.* 1. to *Ordain* both *Deacons*, and *Presbyters*, which the Book incongruouſly calleth *Prieſts*. But, whereas the Epiſcopal Party claimeth *ſole Ordination*, as if no Miniſter can be rightly Ordained, who is not ordained by a Biſhop; and, under this pretence, many of the preſent Prelatical Party ſtick not to degrade and unordain ſuch Miniſters as are Ordained by Presbyters alone (even where no Biſhops are allowed to execute that Office) and Schiſmatically to adviſe and perſwade all to withdraw from all Aſſemblies and Ordinances, as being no Ordinances of Chriſt, where ſuch Miniſters as are ordained onely by the *Presbytery* without a Biſhop, do adminiſter: We muſt give this Anſwer. 1. That there is no Scripture that appropriateth this to Biſhops alone. 2. There are ſeveral warrants in the *New Teſtament* to juſtifie the laying on of hands without a *Biſhop* in their ſenſe. When *Barnabas* and *Saul* (after called *Paul*) were to be ſent out to preach, the Holy Ghoſt commanded to *ſeparate* them for that *Work*; whereupon *Simeon* ſur-named *Niger*, *Lucius* of *Cyrene*, and *Manaen* (not one of them a Biſhop in our Prelatical Advocates ſenſe) *laid hands on them*, and *ſent them forth*, Acts 13. Thus, *Timothee* was ordained by *the laying on of hands of the Presbytery*, 1 Tim. 4. 14. This made him a preaching *Presbyter* and *Biſhop*: although the laying on of *Pauls hands* made him an *Evangeliſt*, 2 Tim. 1. 6. 3. The Book of *Ordination* it ſelf, though it appoint the Biſhop to be προεδρος, the preſident and chief Actor; yet it allows him not to act (as in *Confirmation* of Children) alone, in the *Ordaining* of *Presbyters* or *Prieſts*; But, *the Biſhop with the Prieſts preſent ſhall lay their hands ſeverally upon the head of every one that receiveth Orders*. So, the *Rubrick*: therefore no Biſhop hath ſole power of *Ordination*, nor may he *Ordain alone*. 4. That very Statute of 8. *Eliz.* 1. which ratifieth the Book of *Ordination*, doth not tye all to that one Form, as appears by the Stat. of 13. *Eliz.* 12. which ſaith thus: *Be it Enacted by the Authority of this preſent Parliament, That every perſon under the degree of a Biſhop, which doth, or, ſhall pretend to be a Prieſt or Miniſter of Gods holy Word and Sacraments, by reaſon of any other form of Inſtitution, Conſecration, or Ordering, then the form ſet forth by Parliament, in the time of the late King of moſt worthy memory, King* Edward *the ſixth, or now uſed in the Reign of our moſt gracious Soveraign Lady, before the Feaſt of the Nativity next coming, ſhall in the preſence of the Biſhop*——*Subſcribe to all the Articles of Religion*, &c. Therefore the Law intended not to tye all to the form of *Ordination* by Biſhops; but, tyeth Biſhops to give them Inſtitution if they ſubſcribe the *Articles*, and be otherwiſe qualified as that Act preſcribeth. 5. This is to un-Church all the Proteſtant Churches in Chriſtendom, where there are no Biſhops; and, to deny them Communion with the Church of *England*, which hitherto hath owned them,

and

and held Communion with them as true Churches of Christ.

Now, in few words, we must a little take notice of the necessity of Reforming that Book it self.

1. In the *Preface.* For, where that saith, *It is evident unto all men diligently reading the holy Scripture, and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles time, there hath been these Orders of Ministers in Christs Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons:* it hath been shewed before, that (however we read of *Bishops, Presbyters,* or *Elders,* and *Deacons*) these are not three distinct *Orders* of the Ministry; for that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* are of the same *Order.* Nor are *Presbyters, Priests:* there being no such *name* in the New Testament, nor any such *Office* in the Ministry of the Gospel. Now seeing, this *Preface* is so much made use of, and wrested, to prove an untruth touching the distinction of *Orders*; and, gives such a *name* to *Ministers*, as argues them to be *Sacerdotes Sacrificuli*, sacrificing *Priests*, (which is not so, but repugnant to their *Office*) it ought to be reformed.

2. In the *Ordering* of *Deacons*, the *Bishop* (*alone*) is to lay on hands, whereas it is not so to be done in the *Ordering* of *Priests*, (as they are nick-named) or Consecration of *Bishops.* And this also is contrary to the practice of the Apostles themselves, expressed in that very Scripture, *Act. 6.* appointed to be one of the Epistles to be read at that time; where, after *choosing* the seven *Deacons*, it is said, *These they set before the Apostles; and when they had prayed, THEY* (not, *one* of them) *laid their hands on them.* Now, seeing this was so; and, that at every Ordination of *Deacons*, other Ministers, beside the Bishop, are present; and seeing further, it is said in the third Prayer then used after the Letany, that God did *inspire his Apostles to chuse to this Order*--- St. *Stephen*, with other; which directly crosseth the Text, which saith, *The whole multitude chose them*; and that by order from the Apostles: Why should such a practice be continued by a single Bishop, so contrary to that of the Apostles themselves, and every other *Ordination* in our own Church?

3. In the Ordering of *Priests.* We say, as before, that Title or name of *Priest*, ought to be changed, for the Reasons aboveſaid. But, that which most offendeth, is, that in the very act of *Ordaining*, the Bishop takes upon him to give that, which none but God himself hath power to bestow, where it saith, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, &c. which be the words of *Christ* himself to his Apostles, without any warrant from him to be used by Bishops, or any others. For, however *Ordination* be necessary, yet there can be no reason, that a Bishop, or other persons, should in this assume more in officiating, then in all other Ministrations, where the words of *Institution*, in *Baptism*, in the administring the *Lords Supper*, &c. are first rehearsed; and then, at the act

of

of miniſtring, a Prayer is uſed, not a Magiſterial uſe of the very words of Chriſt himſelf in the firſt inſtitution; as is obvious to all. This therefore ſavors of preſumption, not to be admitted in ſo holy an action: eſpecially, where a Biſhop ſhall (as by report, ſome now do) take upon him to *breathe* upon the perſon he ordaineth, as Chriſt did upon his Apoſtles. Moreover, it being now claimed as peculiar to *Epiſcopacy* (as a diſtinct Order) to have the ſole *power of Ordination*, which hath been proved not to be ſo; It is requiſite that herein alſo ſome Declaration be made to the contrary, that we may not give offence to the Proteſtant Churches with whom we hold Communion; nor admit of ſuch an untruth among our ſelves, to which all muſt ſubſcribe.

4. As for Conſecrating of *Archbiſhops* and *Biſhops*, (in which the ſame Scripture, 1 *Tim.*3. is read again, that was uſed in *Ordaining of Prieſts*; which ſheweth, that the Compilers of that Book never dreamt of a diſtinction of *Orders* between *Biſhops* and *Presbyters*) we onely ſay thus much, That there being no warrant in Scripture for *Archbiſhops*; but onely from the practice of after-times, whereby they were, by men onely, called to that height, we ſee no neceſſity of their *Conſecration*; no more doth our Church; for that it makes the ſame *Conſecration* which is for Biſhops, to ſerve for Archbiſhops. Upon this account, we ſee no reaſon why a ſolemn Oath of Canonical Obedience to the Archbiſhop, ſhould then be adminiſtred to every perſon that is to be Biſhop. The Exception againſt that Expreſſion of the *Archbiſhop* in the act of Conſecration of a Biſhop, *Take the Holy Ghoſt*, being ſpoken to before; here we onely make the ſame profeſſion againſt it, which there we did, and ſo leave it, and proceed to the next Head of Eccleſiaſtical Government, which is *Juriſdiction*.

II.

Of Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction.

IT hath been of late the claim of our Biſhops to have in them the ſole power of *Juriſdiction* in Cauſes Eccleſiaſtical: which is now pleaded for ſo boldly and openly by their Advocates, and ſuch as aſſpire to the ſame Office and Dignity, that it is now made (though very groundleſly) an Eſſential part of *Epiſcopacy*, by Divine Right; witneſs among other, the Author of an *Anſwer to a Letter ſent to Doctor* Turner, to *Oxford*, who alledgeth ſeveral Scriptures, *viz.* 1 *Tim.*5.19. *Tit.*1.5.

Tit. 1. §. to prove that *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction* is in *Bishops onely*. To the same effect, the Author of another Book, intituled, *Church-Lands not to be sold*. So others.

But, seeing *Bishops* can exercise no Jurisdiction in *England*, but what is allowed by the Laws of the Land, as we shall after make it manifest to every eye; we shall not much trouble our selves, at this time, with their claim by *Divine Right*. Howbeit, lest they should think there is nothing to be said against it, we desire it may be considered, (which is known to all that have seriously consulted Antiquity) that in the Primitive Ages of the Church, there was no Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction exercised, but by the Bishops, and their Consistory of Presbyters together. Even, in *Rome* it self, there was, even in *Cyprians* time, a number of the Clergy, who acted with the Bishop, as well as elsewhere. Thence grew (by Corruption) their Conclave of *Cardinals*. And, from the same Original, here in *England*, first, *Monks*; afterwards, *Deans and Chapters*, were joyned with the *Bishops*, to assist both in *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction*: although of late times they joyned with them in neither: Such was the Pride of the one, and the Idleness of the other. Which last, his late Majesty was content to part withal. They being of no use, but onely to confirm Grants of the Bishop; as he, confirmed theirs: keeping sundry Benefices of Cure in their hands, and seldome or never residing on them; under pretence of residence near the Bishop; whereas the Canons of 1603. require them to reside on their *Benefices with Cure*, *all but the space of one moneth in the year* *, unless he be a *Dean*, *Master*, *Warden*, *or chief Governour of a Cathedral*, *or Church*, who, by *Can.* 42. is to reside there, ninety days, *Conjunctim* or *Divisim*. This is spoken not to justifie the Continuation of *Deans* and *Chapters*; or, to move for reducing them to the ancient course of corrupt times, in making them alone to be the Adjutors of Bishops: for *Jurisdiction* is as proper to all the Presbytery, as to those Cathedral Presbyters. But we urge it, meerly and onely to demonstrate the falshood of that upstart Assertion, that *Bishops have sole power of Jurisdiction*.

* Can. 44.

And that we may contract our selves within necessary brevity (considering to whom we make our Address) we shall give but one instance more; and that shall be out of the Book of *Ordination*, in the *Ordering of Priests*. Where, among other *Questions* propounded by the Bishop to him that is to be *ordained* Priest, this is one; *Will you reverently obey your Ordinary, and other chief Ministers, unto whom the Government and Charge is committed over you; following with a glad mind and will their godly Admonition, and submitting your self to their godly Judgements?* To this each of them that are to be ordained, answereth, *I will so do, the Lord being my helper.* By this it is evident, that more, beside Bishops, have power of Jurisdiction. If it be said,

this

this may be meant of *Archdeacons*, *Deans*, &c. that have it under the Biſhop: what is this to the intituling of all Miniſters thereunto? It is anſwered out of the *Rubrick* before the *Communion*, whereby every Curate is authorized to keep off from that Sacrament, *every open and notorious Liver*, by whom *the Congregation is offended, until he have openly declared himſelf to have truely repented, and amended his former wicked life, that the Congregation may thereby be ſatisfied.* Yea, where he finds *hatred and variance*, he is to ſuſpend from the Sacrament, the party refuſing to be reconciled to the other, and *be content to forgive from the bottom of his heart, all that the other hath tranſgreſſed againſt him, and to make amends for that he himſelf hath offended.* What is this, but as much and as high Juriſdiction as any Biſhop can uſe in that particular?

If this ſuffice not, take one paſſage more. In the ſame Book of *Ordination*, in the *Ordering* of *Prieſts*. The *Biſhop* asketh every perſon whom he ordaineth a *Prieſt*, this Queſtion; *Will you give your faithful diligence always ſo to miniſter the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the DISCIPLINE of Chriſt, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Realm hath received the ſame?* &c. To which, each Prieſt is to anſwer, *I will ſo do, by the help of the Lord.* What can be a more clear evidence of the intention of our Church in the firſt Reformation, then to admit all *Presbyters* to have a ſhare in Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, and in the Adminiſtration of it?

How long Biſhops and others under them, have had Eccleſiaſtical *Conſiſtories* to exerciſe Eccleſiaſtical *Juriſdiction*, to us is not certain. Yet it appeareth by Sir *Edw. Cook*, that *William* the Conqueror was the firſt that, by his *Charter* to the *Dean and Chapter of* Lincoln, did prohibit Sheriffs, in their *Tourne* Courts (wherein, before-time, all Eccleſiaſtical matters were heard, and determined) to intermedle any more with Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes, but leave them to the Biſhops. Thence, ſome conclude, that Biſhops have held Courts ever ſince *William* 1. Others, finding no inrollment of that *Charter*, until 2 *Ric.* 2. will not admit of ſo great Antiquity thereof. And the ſame Sir *Edw. Cook* there alledgeth the *Red Book* of *Hen.* 1. *De general. Placitis Comitatuum*, Cap. 8. extant in the Office of the *Kings Rememb.* in the *Exchequer*, wherein, in the Sheriffs *Tourne Court*, is ſaid, *Ibi agantur primo debita verè Chriſtianitatis jura: Secundo, Regis placita; poſtremo, cauſæ ſingulorum dignis ſatisfactionibus expleantur.* There, let be handled, firſt, all due Laws of Chriſtianity, (or, *Court-Chriſtian.*) Secondly, Pleas of the King. Laſtly, Cauſes of particular perſons, &c. *Whereupon they* (that is, others) *conclude that Eccleſiaſtical cauſes were handled in the Tourn*, in *H.* 1. *long after the ſaid* ſuppoſed *Charter.* Then he addeth, *And certain it is, the Biſhops Conſiſtories were erected, and cauſes Eccleſiaſtical removed from the Tourn to the Conſiſtory after the making of the ſaid Red Book.*

4 Inſtit. ca. 53. p. 2259.

But,

But, let the Antiquity thereof, be what it will; it is moſt certain, that however the Popes and their Agents did often intrude, and uſurp Authority within this Realm, yet the King and Parliament ever held the Biſhops and Clergy of *England* within the verge of the Laws of the Land; never permitting them, either by colour of *Magna Charta*, or otherwiſe, to exerciſe any Authority, but with ſubmiſſion to the Municipal Laws. So that, whoever ſhall endeavour to put them into any further power, (in caſe they have a mind to reſtore them to former Juriſdictions) doth put to his hand to make them ſo many Popes; which this Realm, even in times of Popiſh Religion here, would never endure.

And whereas ſome are pleaſed to affirm, that by the Statute of 25. *Hen.* 8. *cap.* 19. there was a ſtricter reſtraint laid upon the Biſhops and Clergy, than in the times before, when they ſate in Convocation, *viz.* No Canons ſhould be made and put in exerciſe, that were *contrariant or repugnant* to the Laws of the Land: it is manifeſt that the ſame limitation was long before ſet upon them. For Sir *Edw. Cook* (*ibid.* cap. 74. pag. 323.) ſaith, That the *King did often appoint Commiſſioners by Writ, to ſit with them at the Convocation, and to have cognizance of ſuch things as they meant to eſtabliſh, that nothing ſhould be done in prejudice*, &c. and for this he citeth 51. *Ed.* 3. nu. 42. 46. *Edw.* 3. prem. 8. 21. *Ed.* 4. 45. *Rot. Parl.* 1 *Ric.* 2. *nu:* 114. from which he concludeth, that the Statute of 25. *H.* 8. 19. *is but Declaratory of the old Common Law.*

And, ſo ſtrict were the Kings anciently over Biſhops and Archbiſhops too, that when the Clergy *petitioned in Parliament* (51. Edw. 3. num. 83.) *that of every Conſultation conditional, the Ordinary may of himſelf take upon him the true underſtanding thereof, and therein proceed accordingly*, (that is, without appeal to the King, whereupon *Delegates* by Commiſſion under the Great Seal, might hear and determine the ſame.) *The Kings anſwer was, that the King cannot depart with his right, but to yeeld to his Subjects according to Law.* To which Sir *Edw. Cook* ſubjoyns an *Item* to all his Readers, *Nota hoc, & ſtude bene.* 4 Inſtit. ca. 74. *of* A chdeacons. p. 339.

Nay, this is not all. For, ſo far did the Kings of *England*, engage in the over-ruling of Biſhops, that they did not onely limit their Juriſdiction, but allowed them not liberty to make a Will without licence from the King, till they made compoſition with him; as the ſame Author telleth us, ſaying, *It appears by many Records in the reigns of* H. 3. Edw. 1. *(as taking ſome one or two examples for many) that by the Law and cuſtome of* England, *no Biſhop could make his Will of his Goods or Chattels coming of his Biſhoprick*, &c. *without the Kings licence. The Biſhops, that they might freely make their Wills, yeelded to give to the King, after their deceaſes reſpectively for ever, ſix things:* Ibid. p. 38

1. *Their beſt Horſe, or Palfree, with Bridle and Saddle.* 2. *A Cloke with a Cape.* 3. *One Cup with a Cover.* 4. *One Baſon and Ewre.* 5. *One Ring of Gold.* 6. *His Kennel of Hounds.* *For theſe, a Writ iſſueth out of the Exchequer after the deceaſe of every Biſhop.* Whether this be ſtill in uſe, we meddle not; but mention it, onely to ſhew what a ſtrict eye our Kings have ever had upon Biſhops, ſo as the Law allows them not power ſo much as of their own perſonal Eſtates, much leſs of Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, without the King.

What power they had in the *High Commiſſion Court*, is needleſs to mention, the Court being happily laid aſide by the Statute of 17 *Car.* 1. *cap.* 11. But, whereas they inſiſted upon *ſole Juriſdiction*, and now begin to exerciſe it; or at leaſt, to renew their claim thereunto, it is very well known, that by the Statute of 1. *Edw.* 6. 2. they could hold no Courts, but in the Kings name; nor that, without Commiſſion under the Great Seal: which power was indeed revived and re-eſtabliſhed by the Act of 1. *Eliz.* after it had been repealed 1. *Mar.* 2. Howbeit, all that power is again repealed, and made void for ever, by the ſame Act of 17. *Car.* 1. and now, no Commiſſions to be granted them any more. To make this out, we ſhall rehearſe the words of both thoſe Acts of Parliament, which run thus:

1. The Act of 1. *Eliz. cap.* 1. having firſt *united and annexed all Spiritual and Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction* to the Imperial Crown of this *Kingdom*, it after addeth what power ſhall be given by *Commiſſion* under the *Great Seal*, to exerciſe the ſame, in this following Clauſe onely, *viz.* *And that your Highneſs, your Heirs and Succeſſors, Kings or Queens of this Realm, ſhall have full Power and Authority by vertue of this Act, by Letters patents under the Great Seal of* England, *to aſſigne, name and authorize, when, and as often as your Highneſs, your Heirs or Succeſſors, ſhall think meet and convenient, and for ſuch and ſo long time as ſhall pleaſe your Highneſs, your Heirs or Succeſſors, ſuch perſon or perſons being natural born Subjects to your Highneſs, your Heirs or Succeſſors, as your Majeſty, your Heirs or Succeſſors, ſhall think meet, to exerciſe and uſe, occupy and execute, under your Highneſs, your Heirs and Succeſſors, all manner of Juriſdictions, Priviledges, and Preheminencies, in any wiſe touching or concerning any Spiritual or Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, within theſe your Realms of* England *and* Ireland, *or any other your Highneſſes Dominions and Countries.* *And to viſit, reform, redreſs, order, correct and amend all ſuch Errors, Hereſies, Schiſms, Abuſes, Offences, Contempts and Enormities whatſoever, which by any manner Spiritual or Eccleſiaſtical Power, Authority or Juriſdiction, can, or may lawfully be reformed, ordered, redreſſed, corrected, reſtrained or amended, to the pleaſure of Almighty God, the increaſe of Vertue, and the Conſervation of the Peace and Unity of this Realm.* *And that ſuch perſon or perſons ſo to be named, aſſigned, authorized, and appointed by your Highneſs, your Heirs or Succeſſors,*

cessours, after the said Letters Patents to him or them made and delivered, as is aforesaid, shall have full power and authority by vertue of this Act, and of the said Letters Patents, under your Highness, your Heirs or Successours, to exercise, use, and execute all the premises, according to the tenour and effect of the said Letters Patents: any matter, or cause to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding. This is one entire Clause of that Act; nor is there any Branch or Clause in that whole Act that gives more, or other Jurisdiction to Bishops, or any other Ecclesiastical persons whatsoever.

2. Now the Act of 17. *Car.* 1. 11. having repeted this *Clause* at large, addeth, *Be it Enacted by the Kings most excellent Majesty, and the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, That the aforesaid Branch, Clause, Article, or Sentence, contained in the said Act, and every word, matter and thing contained in that Branch, Clause, Article, or Sentence, shall from henceforth be repealed, annulled, revoked, annihilated and utterly made void for ever, any thing in the said Act to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding.* This (as we humbly conceive) puts a period to all Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction of *Bishops*, *Deans* and *Chapters*, and *Archdeacons*, whatsoever.

And even before that Act, of 17. *Car.* 1. that Government which they exercised was without; yea, contrary to Law. For, whereas by the Statute of 1. *Edw.* 6. 2. it was Enacted that *all Summons and Citations, or other process Ecclesiastical, in all Suits and Causes*, &c. *should from the first day of July thence next following be made in the name, and with the stile of the King, as it is in Writs Original, or Judicial at the Common Law. And that the* Teste *thereof be in the name of the Archbishop, or Bishop, or other having Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, who hath the Commission* and grant of the Ecclesiastical *Authority immediately from the Kings Highness. And that his Commissary, Official, or Substitute exercising jurisdiction under him, shall put his name in the Citation, or Process, after the* Teste. And that they, *in all Seals of their Office shall have the Kings Highness Arms, decently set, with certain Characters under the Arms, for the knowledge of the Diocess, and shall use no other Seal of Jurisdiction*, &c. *upon pain of his Majesties displeasure, and imprisonment during his Majesties pleasure* *.

* So also it is Enacted 1. *Edw.* 6. 12. that they should make their Process and Writings in the Ks. name, and not under their own names; and that their Seals should be the Kings Arms.

In which Act nevertheless, they were allowed to use their own Seals, in admission and ordering all their own *Officers*, in all *Certificates*, in *all Collations, Presentations, Institutions, and Inductions of Benefices, Letters of Orders, or Dimissories*, as formerly was accustomed.

But, under colour of this last Toleration, they have used their own *Names*, and *Seals* onely, in all Ecclesiastical *Jurisdictions*, for many years last *past*, without taking the least notice of King or Queen, or taking any special Commission from them, for ought hath appeared in any of their pretendedly juridical proceedings, which are therefore

apprehended to be all void in Law, albeit they had obtained, in ſecret, Letters, Patents ſo to act as they have done. For that Statute being repealed in 1. *Mar.* 2. was again, in general terms revived and re-eſtabliſhed in 1. *Eliz.* 1. and never ſince made void.

And whereas our Biſhops and Archbiſhops in *England* and *Wales*, are in all but twenty ſix in number, which being far too few to be able to execute the Office of Biſhops, as by the Word of God they are bound to do, there was in the 26th year of *Hen.* 8. *cap.* 14. an Act of Parliament made for adding ſix and twenty *Suffragan Biſhops* more unto them; which that Statute ſaith, *hath been accuſtomed to be had in this Realm.* It was Enacted, that *Thetford, Ipſwich, Colcheſter, Dover, Gilford, Southhampton, Taunton, Shaftsbury, Molton, Marleborough, Bedford, Leiceſter, Gloceſter, Shrewsbury, Briſtol, Penreth, Bridgwater, Notingham, Grantham, Hull, Huntington, Cambridge*, and the Town of *Pereth*, and *Barwick*, St. *Germans* in *Cornwal*, and the *Iſle* of *Wight ſhall be taken and accepted for Sees of Biſhops Suffragans to be made in this Realm.* Theſe to be choſen thus: Every Archbiſhop and Biſhop that would have *Suffragans*, muſt for each place nominate two perſons to the King, whereof the King to chuſe one, and to give him *the name, title, and dignity of Biſhop* of ſuch of the Sees aforeſaid, as he ſhould be nominated unto, and he to be called *Biſhop Suffragan* of that See. And the King by his Letters Patents, is to preſent him to the Archbiſhop of the Province, where this Suffragan is to be; requiring the Archbiſhop (with two Biſhops or Suffragans more, to be procured by the Biſhop that names him) to *Conſecrate* the ſaid perſon, to the *ſame name, title, ſtile and dignity* of Biſhop, as to the Office of a *Biſhop Suffragan* appertaineth: and then to execute ſuch power and authority as by the Archbiſhop, or Biſhop within whoſe Dioceſs he is to be, he ſhall be Commiſſionated to do, but no other, under pain of a *Premunire*; but not to partake any of the Profits of the Biſhoprick of the Dioceſs.

But our Biſhops like none of this, although heretofore uſed: which Act, being repealed by Queen *Mary*, was revived in 1. *Eliz.* 1. by name, and is ſtill in force. Therefore, in ſtead of twenty ſix Biſhops, to deſire fifty two, is no Puritanical requeſt, but a legal and juſt demand. For there are ſo many allowed by Law already. Yea, if two hundred Biſhops ſhould be ſetled in *England*, they would be too few to execute all the duties which, by the Word, are incumbent on a Biſhop. And verily, we are perſwaded in Conſcience, that this muſt be done, if there be any due care of Souls, by ſuch as have power to do it, if Epiſcopacy be again ſet up in *England*. And we ſpeak thus, becauſe we apprehend, that by Act of Parliament all their power and juriſdiction is abſolutely taken away; and therefore, by conſequent, the Office it ſelf, although the Ordinance of both Houſes of Parliament of *October* 9. 1646. had never been. For when their power of *Juriſdiction* is gone

for

for ever, what, of the Office of a Bishop, as such, remaineth? This was the sense of both Houses of Parliament, as appears by that *Ordinance* which makes all their Grants since 17. *Car.* 1. to be null and void, because their Office then expired.

If it shall be thought fit to set up *Episcopacy* again, We most humbly pray, that it may be no other but that Primitive Episcopacy, agreeable to the Apostles rules, in that form, method and power mentioned in the Book of *Reduction of Episcopacy*, composed and published in the year 1641. by Dr. *James Usher late Archbishop of Armagh*: always provided, that there be such a competent number of Bishops set up, as may be able faithfully and profitably to discharge the Office of a *Bishop* according to the mind of Christ expressed in his Word.

If the late Episcopal Party shall pretend and plead, that unless Bishops be restored to all their power and pomp they arrogated before 17. *Car.* they shall not be able to do his Majesty that service which otherwise they might, if so restored. To this it is answered, 1. That if they mean thereby, that they cannot do his Majesty service in Parliament, unless they be restored to their Lordships again, and re-admitted to the *House of Peers*; we cannot think, but that there be Noble Lords enow left in that Honourable House, who are far more able to do his Majesty service, then the Bishops can do there. 2. Whereas the Bishops and Clergy obtained a Command and Charter from *William* 1. to exclude the Sheriff and the rest of the Laity from medling with matters Ecclesiastical, in their Courts (as was before shewed) we see no reason why Bishops (excluded in 17. *Car.* 1. his reign) should be again admitted to intermeddle in the Supreme Court and Judicatory of the Realm, in Civil Affairs. 3. If they be confined to the Apostolique Constitution, and more Bishops made, they will be in a capacity of doing God, and his Majesty more and better service, in a more diligent and circumspect Government of the Church, then ever yet they have done, or were able to do. By all which it appeareth, that if they labour to recover their former power, the pretence of doing his Majesty *better service*, is but to make way to their own Greatness, and to render them less able to serve God or the King, as in that Office they ought. Nor will his Majesties interest in the Clergy be diminished by making more Bishops (without an election by a *Dean and Chapter*) but much increased, if by Act of Parliament the same Course be taken for the election of all Bishops, which by the *Statute* of 26. *H.* 8. 14. is appointed for the constituting of *Bishops Suffragan*: and their power of *Jurisdiction* set out unto them by the King and Parliament, as it was in 1. *Eliz.* at what time, the *Articles* to be ministred in all their *Visitations*, were set forth by the *Queen*, &c. are yet extant, with her *Injunctions*. Hereby also his Majesty would be sure to have a far greater influence into all the Clergy of note, by how much

much the more the number of Bishops is increased, and more learned men, made capable of such preferments; which a quarter of them cannot be, if Episcopacy be confined to twenty six Bishops.

III.

Of Discipline.

HAving spoken of the *Subject*, or Persons in whom the *Power* of *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*, by the Laws of the Realm, resided; we proceed to offer somewhat touching the *Rules* or Laws for execution thereof, under this Head of *Discipline*, which containeth the *Canons*, or Rules, to wit, the *Kings Ecclesiastical Laws*, by which alone all persons trusted with Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, have been enabled to exercise that Government.

How that *Discipline* is bounded, appeareth in and by the Acts of Parliament still in force, in 25. *H.* 8. 19. and 1. *Eliz.* 1. which bounds, a great *Scholist* is pleased to call *sad restrictions and limitations* *. The bounds in the former Act are these. 1. That none of the Clergy should *from thence forth, presume to attempt, alledge, claim, or put in ure any Constitutions, or Ordinances Provincial, or Synodals, or any other Canons; Nor, shall enact, promulge, or execute any such Canons, Constitutions, or Ordinances Provincial, by whatsoever name, or names they may be called in their Convocations, in time coming (which always shall be assembled by Authority of the Kings Writ) unless the same Clergy may have the Kings most Royal Assent, and License, to make, promulge, and execute such Canons, Constitutions, and Ordinances Provincial, or Synodal, upon pain of every one of the said Clergy, doing contrary to this Act; and being thereof convict, to suffer imprisonment, and make Fine at the Kings Will.* It is true, that, at the suit of the then *Clergy*, *divers Constitutions, Ordinances, and Canons Provincial, or Synodal, which heretofore had been Enacted, and then thought to be not only much prejudicial to the Kings Prerogative royal, and repugnant to the Laws and Statutes of this Realm, but also over-much onerous to his Highness Subjects*: by that Act, the King was to chuse thirty two Persons, to review, approve, or reject the same; which being begun, but not perfected by the time limited, so as to get the *Royal Assent* thereunto, that Act revived in 3. 4. *Edw.* 6. authorizing him to chuse thirty two Persons, to perfect that work. The persons were chosen, they did the work, compiled a Book intituled *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, yet extant: but for lack of the

* D *Heylin, Certam. Epistol.* pag. 89. which sheweth how they like the Laws, and how far, they would go, in making Laws, that they must.

1. Edw. 6. c. 11.

the Royal Assent thereunto, within the time prefixed, that Act expired, and, their Book of *Reformation*, with it: which was never since renewed.

In the Act of 25. *H.* 8. 19. it is *provided*, that *such Canons, Constitutions, Ordinances, and Synodals Provincial being already made, which be not contrariant, nor repugnant to the Laws, Statutes and Customes of this Realm; nor to the damage or hurt of the Kings Prerogative-Royal, shall now still be used and executed as they were before the making of this Act, till such time as they be viewed, searched, or otherwise ordered & determined by the said thirty two persons, or the more part of them, according to the tenor, form and effect of this present Act.* 1 El. 1.

By occasion hereof, Dr. *Heylin* * affirmeth, that so much of the Popes *Canon-Law*, (first intended for the Church in general) as is not contrary to the Laws, Customs, &c. of the Land, is still in force, in our Courts Ecclesiastical, as the Civil or Imperial Laws are, in our Courts of *Admiralty*, and *Prerogative*, for *probate of Wills*. But we humbly conceive this cannot be so, because however the Civil Law is still in use in *maritime*, and *Testamentary* Affairs, in regard that Forrainers, as well as Natives, are, or may be therein concerned; and so those Civil Laws are permitted; not, in relation to the *Emperour*, but as the Law of Nations, which never was by any Act of Parliament, in those cases, prohibited in *England*. The Popes Canon-Law, on the contrary, is ever since disabled by the Statute of 24. *H.* 8. 12. and by that Act before-mentioned, is wholly abrogated, and null. For, if his power be renounced, can his Laws (which are the chief part of a Law-givers power) be still in force; especially, where no Canons, but such as have the *Royal Assent*, may be used in *England?* And if that might be admitted, yet that very *Proviso*, in the Statute of 25. *H.* 8. 19. puts a period to it, after the time the thirty two persons, or major part of them, did view and search them, and drew up a Body of Ecclesiastical Laws to be used here, (which the same Doctor confesseth they did) although the want of the Kings *Assent*, made it not valid in Law. For, the Proviso doth not say, the old Canons shall be used till the King *Assent*; but, onely *till such time as they be viewed, searched*; or, *otherwise ordered and determined by them, or the more part of them*. Nor doth that Act in any Clause, mention any other *Canons or Constitutions*, but such as are *Provincial*, or called by other names, always presumed, and mentioned to be made in *Convocations* in *England*; not in the *Popes Conclave*. * *ubi supra.*

And to the end it may yet further appear, that he who so confidently taketh upon him to improve his knowledge to whom he wrote that Epistle, hath mis-informed him, and wrested the Laws also; take notice, that the *Canon-Laws* of *England*, are onely such as are, or have been made in *England*. These are of two sorts; *Legatine*, or *Provincial*.

Provincial. The *Legatine* were, 77 *Canons* and *Constitutions*; whereof, 26 were made by *Otho* the Popes *Legate*, President of a Synod here in *England*; the other, 51. in another Synod, after holden under *Othobone*, Legate of the Pope in 32. *Hen.* 3. An. 1248. The *Provincial* Constitutions were such as, in several places of *England*, were made under the Archbishops of *Canterbury*: in all, 212. whereof the first 48. were made under *Stephen Langhton*, in the reign of King *John*; and the last three, were made under *Henry Chichley*, in the reign of *Hen.* 5. These *Provincial* Constitutions, about the year 1422. were digested into a Body by *William Lindwood*, who also wrote a Commentary upon them; the other, by *Johannes de Aton*, Canon of *Lincoln*, who likewise Commented upon them: all which, are yet extant.

Now, we must understand, the Act of 25. *H.* 8. 19. speaks onely of *Canons, Constitutions, Ordinances Provincial, or other, or by whatsoever name they be called in their* CONVOCATION. These, and no other, were to be reviewed; and, out of these, such as by the thirty two persons chosen by *Hen.* 8. or *Edw.* 6. should be *viewed, ordered*, and *determined* to stand, were onely to be in force, as is evident to every impartial eye that shall consult the Statute. And these, having been in 4. *Edw.* 6. viewed; and, thereupon, by *Gualter Haddon*, under Archbishop *Cranmer*, and four *Classes* into which the said thirty two persons were divided, that Book, called, *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, (saith the *Preface* thereunto) were compiled. And these being so composed, and published, that all might object what they could (if they had ought) against them, before Confirmation; the King died before his Royal Assent was given; and so, they never were confirmed. But yet, the very *viewing, ordering*, and *determining* of those old Constitutions, (be they what they could) were, by the closing *Proviso* forementioned, in 25. *H.* 8. all void, and of none effect.

And, albeit divers *Canons*, or *Constitutions*, were made in Q. *Elizabeths* reign, (beside those *Injunctions*, and *Articles* for *Visitations*, in her first year) yet none of them being (for ought we know) confirmed by the Royal Assent, under the *Great Seal*, are now, by any, reputed Obligatory. It be then onely the *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, treated upon by the Bishop of* London, *President of the Convocation for the Province of* Canterbury, *and the rest of the Bishops and Clergy of the said Province; and, agreed upon with the Kings Majesties licence in that Synod begun at* London, An. Dom. 1603. in the first year of King *James* his reign over *England*; and, after published by his said Majesties Authority, under the *Great Seal of England*: which can now be so much as pretended to be of any force.

And

And here we shall not dispute their validity, after that Kings death, they being not since re-established by King *Charles* the first: but, we shall onely speak to the Legality of them, as they were once ratified; and as they are any of them *contrariant and repugnant* to the *Laws* or *Customes* of the Land. As for *Customes*, (which the Statute of 25. *H.* 8. 19. referreth to, as well as to the *Laws*) we shall say little, because this is more proper for Lawyers, upon Prohibitions, granted out of his Majesties Civil Courts, to consider, and debate. We therefore consider of the *Canons*, or such of them onely as are *repugnant* to any of the *Laws* in force.

This is a large Field: Those Canons being no less than 141. in number, which are more then heretofore were ever made in any three *Synods* (by whomsoever held) in *England*. We shall therefore keep onely to such as we find most contrariant to those Laws, which we are in duty bound chiefly to take notice of. As for instance.

Of those twelve *Canons*, under the first Head or Title, *viz. Of the Church of* England, there be eleven of them, the breach of any of which, is to be punished with *Excommunication* ipso facto, *not to be revoked till such as breake them, after repent, and publickly revoke their wicked errours.* The persons to be excommunicated, are, I. *Impugners of the Kings Supremacy:* Can. 2. II. All that *affirm the Church of* England *is not a true and Apostolical Church, teaching and maintaining the Doctrine of the Apostles:* Can. 3. where, it is not defined what *the Church of* England *is.* III. *Impugners of the publick Worship of God, established:* Can. 4. which few know to be *established.* IV. *Impugners of the Articles of Religion, agreed upon,* 1562. Can. 5. the establishment whereof, is doubtful. V. *Impugners of the Rites and Ceremonies established,* Can. 6. of which there is no certainty. VI. *Impugners of the Government of the Church of* England, *by Archbishops, Bishops,* &c. Can. 7. there being none such. VII. *Impugners of the form of consecrating and ordering Archbishops, Bishops,* &c. or *that any thing in it is repugnant to the Word of God,* Can. 8. there being in the form no such Words as *ordering of Archbishops and Bishops:* and it having been made out that there be contradictions in it; one of which, is repugnant to the Word. VIII. *Authors of Schism:* Can. 9. IX. Maintainers of (such as the Canons call) *Schismaticks:* that is, who affirm such Ministers as *refuse to subscribe to the Book of Common-prayer,* &c. Can. 10. which is hard to prove. X. *Maintainers of Conventicles:* Can. 11. that is, of such as maintain that *there are in* England, *other Meetings, Assemblies, or Congregations of the Kings born Subjects, then such as by the Laws are allowed, which may rightly claim the name of true and lawful Churches.* XI. *Maintainers of Constitutions made in Conventicles, without the Kings Authority; and, submit to them:* Can. 12. So all the *Rules* confirmed by Parliament, for *Church-Government*, make the Parliament lyable to Excommuni-

cation; and the Assemby too, and all the Presbyterians in *England*.

Besides these, there is, *Can.* 59. for excommunicating *Ministers* refusing to *Catechise every Sunday*, after a third offence herein complained of. So, *Can.* 68. decreeth *Ministers refusing to Christen, or Bury*, to be excommunicated *Majori Excommunicatione*. And *Canon* 72. ordaineth that if a Minister, without License from the Bishop, under his hand and seal, appoint or keep fasts, or *be present at them, either publiquely, or in any private Houses, other then such as by Law, are, or by publique Authority shall be appointed*, he shall for the first offence be *suspended*; for the second, *excommunicated*; and, for the third, *deposed* from the Ministry. Lastly, the 73. *Canon*, excommunicateth *ipso facto*, all *Ministers* and others *meeting in any private house, or elsewhere*, to consult upon any matter or course to be taken by them, or upon their motion or direction by any other, which may any way tend to the impeaching or depraving of the Doctrine of the Church of* England, *or of the Book of Common-prayer, or of any part of the discipline now established.* What is that?

*What, if in *Parliament*; or, in *Convocation?*

Now, this sentence of *Excommunication*, being to be pronounced by a Minister onely, and, after to be publiquely denounced by other Ministers; and the persons excommunicated upon the 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, and 11th Canons, not to be restored but by the *Archbishop*; and every such person (not restored) is liable to the Writ *De excommunicato capiendo*; (or else the excommunication signifies nothing) we appeal to all whether these *Canons* (if executed) be not against the *Stat.* of 5. *Eliz.* 23. which Enacteth, that if, in the *Significavit* (of the Ordinary) for obtaining a Writ *de excom. capiend. it be not contained, that the excommunication doth proceed upon some cause or contempt of some original matter of Heresie, or refusing to have his or their child baptized, or to receive the holy Communion as it is now commonly used to be received in the Church of* England, *or to come to Divine-service now commonly used in the said Church of* England, *or Error in matters of Religion, or Doctrine now received or allowed in the Church of* England, *Incontinency, Usury, Simony, Perjury in the Ecclesiastical Court, or Idolatry*; Then all such *Writs*, and *Significavits* to be *void in Law*. And whether such Ministers as in *Court*, or in Churches, pronounce, or publish such *excommunications*; or, for *non-appearance, non-payment of Fees*, &c. (too too commonly practiced in those late Courts,) be not liable to be punished, by an Action at Law, for doing such illegal Acts, as are not justifiable by the Laws of the Land: Or, if such a Writ will lye against any man for *Heresie*, (not declared such by Parliament according to 1. *Eliz.* 1.) for *not receiving the Communion, kneeling*; or, for *not coming to the Common-prayer*; as now *used* (it being already made out that it is not established by Law;) or, for dissenting from any of the *Articles of Religion* of *An.* 1562. (when it hath been shewed

that

that some of them are *doubtful*, some *defective*, and disagreeing from one another, &c.) is it not high time to *Reform* these things; especially, when by the *Canons*, not *kneeling*, not coming to Common-prayer, are declared to be *Schism*; and any *dissent* from those *Articles*, being adjudged *errour in doctrine*, the party shall be punished with *excommunication*; yea, with *imprisonment*, by *Writ* out of *Chancery*; and not be *absolved*, but by the *Archbishop*, (Can. 5.) nor, by him, till he shall have *repented*, and openly revoked that his *dissent*, as a *wicked errour*; how just, and necessary soever such *dissent was*?

Again, the 14th *Canon* appoints Divine service to be said, not only on the *Holy-days* appointed by the Book of Common-prayer, but on *their Eves*. Which observation of *Eves*, is taken away by the Books of Common-prayer; and so this Canon is herein contrary to the Act of 1. *Eliz.* 2. Moreover, the same Canon enjoyneth Ministers to observe *the Orders, Rites, and Ceremonies prescribed in the Book of Common-prayer*, which by referring to these in 2. *Edw.* 6. admits of a *Surplice only*, so doth that of 5.6. *Edw.* 6. yet this enterferes with the 58. *Canon*; of which, before. And whereas that 14th *Canon* forbids *diminishing* any part of *Common-prayer*, in *regard of preaching, or in any other respect, or adding any thing in the matter or form thereof*; the Book of Common-prayer it self, doth warrant us to *diminish*, that is, to omit all that men now call the *second Service*; when there is no *Communion*, as hath been also shewed.

The 17th *Canon* enjoyneth *all Fellows, Scholars, and Students* (though Boys) as well as *Masters of Colleges and Halls*, upon *Sundays, Holy-days* and their *Eves*, to wear *Surplices* at *Divine service*, pretending for it, the *Order of the Church of* England: and *Graduates* to wear the *Hoods of their degrees*. Whereas the Order in the Liturgy enjoyns Surplices only to Ministers in *the times of their Ministration*: not to others. And this of Boys wearing *Surplices*, doth countenance that fond conceit so much cryed up in Popery, that all once entred into Colleges, ought to receive *primam tonsuram*, and therefore to wear *Surplices* *.

* *Ham. le Strange* in Affin. of Div. Serv.

The 24 *Canon* enjoyneth *Copes*: which are forbidden in the *Rubrick* before *Common-prayer*, in 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. of which, before. The 27th *Canon*, requireth Ministers not to *administer* the Communion to any but such as *kneel*, under pain of *Suspension*; whereas, we have before demonstrated out of 2. *Edw.* 6. that *kneeling* is left arbitrary. And, if any person not *kneeling*, be refused the Communion, with what justice can he be punished with *Excommunication* (which may end in *imprisonment* upon a Writ *De excom. cap.* by vertue of the forementioned Statute of 5. *Eliz.* 23.) even when he desireth to communicate with that Liberty in gesture which the Law alloweth him? Yet, both *Minister*, *Church-Wardens* and *Quest-men* (the Office and duty

of which last; in Ecclesiasticals, we know not) must take notice whether every Parishioner come so often to the Communion as the Law requireth, *Can.* 28. which if he do not, he is to be *presented*, &c. which makes way to *Excommunication*, and *imprisonment*, as aforesaid, albeit it be not his fault that he received not: unless it be an offence, to claim, and make use of the liberty which the Law affordeth him.

The *Explanation of the lawful use of the Cross in Baptism*, undertaken in *Can.* 30. is very defective: for, whereas it undertakes to *remove all scruples of* Conscience therein, it produceth not one *Scripture*, nor *Father* to that end: but only indefinitely talks of both; which, without better arguments and more distinct proofs, can never, in common reason, quiet (much less satisfie) any mans Conscience that maketh scruple thereof. Nor can we submit thereto, till we see it proved, as well as affirmed.

The 31. *Canon* forbiddeth the making of any *Deacons*, or Ministers, save only on the four Sundays after the *Ember-Weeks*, appointed for prayer and fasting, and so continued in *England* (by what Law, when the *Stat.* of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. 3. declares the contrary?) and this to be done *in the Cathedral, or Parish-church where the Bishop resideth*, in presence not onely of the *Archdeacon*, but of the *Dean* and two *Prebendaries* at least (if not by any lawful cause let, or hindred) or, of *four other learned and grave Persons, Masters of Art at the least, and allowed for publique Preachers.* What Law, for confining Ordination to four times a year? If there be a Law, do Bishops now observe it? Is it not usual to ordain in other mens Dioceses: which they can no more legally do, then a Sheriff execute his Office, when he is out of his County? How often do *Deans* and *Prebendaries* assist at Ordinations? And why must all other Assistants be *Masters of Arts at least?* What Law, or Rule for any of these things; unless, for being *Assistants* to, and *Co-ordainers* with the Bishop; which, this *Canon* doth tacitely deny, when it saith, such and such shall be *present:* but, not a word of their *Laying on of Hands*, according to the Book of *Ordination?*

And whereas by the 36th *Canon*, *Subscription* is enjoyned to the Books of *Common-prayer*, and of *Ordination*, not only upon all Ordinations, and *Institutions* to Benefices, &c. which, by *Can.* 37. is required also of all Lecturers, Catechists, Readers; yea, (by *Can.* 77.) of all *School-masters* too, (unless to the last clause of *Art.* 2. touching *using the book* of Common-prayer) whereas the Statute of 13. *Eliz.* 12. requires no subscription but to the 39. Articles: nor that, save only of such as are to be *instituted* to a Benefice: not at *Ordination*, or at taking Licenses to Preach only. The 38th *Canon* touching *Revolters after Subscription*, hath been spoken to before.

The 40th *Canon* enjoyning an Oath against *Simony*, is necessary; yet,

against

againſt Law; and particularly, againſt *the Petition of Right*. This therefore we ſay no more of, but humbly pray, ſuch an Oath may be impoſed by Law. But, whereas the 49th *Canon* prohibiteth *Miniſters* not to expound Scripture, &c. if not Licenſed by the Biſhop; this is expreſly contrary to Law (8. *Eliz.* 1.) which confirmeth the Book of Ordination, in and by which every one ordained a *Presbyter*, hath the Bible delivered into his hand by the Biſhop, with theſe Words, *Take thou Authority to preach the Word of God*, &c. Yet, muſt every ſuch ordained Miniſter be compelled to be at the charge of taking out a further Licenſe from the ſame Biſhop, at the ſame time, to preach in the ſame place; or elſe, not to perform that duty, which he promiſed ſolemnly to the Biſhop, and by him was authorized to perform, at his *Ordination*. Nor may any Miniſters be ſuffered (by the 51. *Canon*) to preach in any other Church, without *ſhewing* ſuch Licenſe, although otherwiſe well known to be ſufficiently authorized thereunto. And whereas the 62. *Canon* alloweth Miniſters to celebrate Matrimony between other perſons, without asking the Bannes in Churches, if they have a *Licenſe* for doing of it from the Biſhop, Archdeacon, or their Officials; this is expreſly contradictory to the Book of Common-prayer, Rubrick 1. before *the form of Matrimony*: and ſo, contrary to Law, of 1. *Eliz.* 2. if that Book be confirmed thereby.

There be ſundry other Exceptions juſtly to be taken to the Book of *Canons*, (as namely, to ſuch *Eccleſiaſtical Offices*, beſides *Biſhops and Presbyters*, as be admitted to bear a ſhare in *Eccleſiaſtical* Juriſdiction; albeit they be *Lay-men*; while yet they abominate *Lay-Elders* in the *Presbyterian* Government, beſide many other) all which, we at preſent, forbear; not, as approving of them, but, as hoping for a Reformation of that as well as of other things. We therefore ſhall now only with all humility, propound a few *Queries*, very neceſſary, as we conceive, to be ſeriouſly conſidered.

1 *Quere*: Whether, if there be any thing of ſubſtance altered in, or added to the *Articles of Religion*, or Books of *Common-Prayer*, or *Ordination*; and, thoſe *Alterations*, or *Additions* not expreſly mentioned, and confirmed by Parliament: this doth not make thoſe Books to be void in Law, if pleaded at Law? The Grounds of this *Quere*, are, the Acts of 13. *Eliz.* 12. as touching the *Articles*: that, of 1. *Eliz.* 2. as to the Book of *Common-prayer*: and, the Statute of *Eliz.* 8. and of 5. 6. *Edw.* 6. 1. as to *Ordination*. Which laſt named *Act*, ſaith, that the Books therein mentioned were annexed to the ſaid Statute; yet are they not to be found inrolled therewith: no more is the other Book of *Articles*, in 13. *Eliz.* inrolled with that Act.

2 *Quere*: Whether the Statutes which are ſaid to confirm any of the things named in the former Quere, mentioning only the *Titles*, but not reciting the matter of the Books themſelves, do make thoſe Books, or

the things contained in them, (which have been several times altered, although never so much as said to be inrolled, nor found so to be) do make those things to be established and good in Law, because now commonly reputed, received, and generally used as ratified by Law?
The Ground of this *Quere*, is, that clause in 1. *Eliz.* 2. which after mentioning some *Alterations* (but not particularly naming them) in the *Common-prayer-book*, prohibiteth all other *Alterations*, saying, [*And none other, or otherwise.*]

3 *Quere*: If any man be indited, or sued at Law, upon the Statute of 1. *Eliz.* 2. for not *reading* of, or coming to *hear* the Book of *Common-prayer*; or, upon the Stat. of 13. *Eliz.* 12. for not reading the *Articles* of 1562: and, the Defendant plead *Not guilty*, and deny these Books to be those confirmed by those Laws, till the Plaintiff prove them to be of Record; whether is not the Plaintiff bound to prove that, and in the mean time, the Defendant not punishable by those Statutes? The Grounds of this *Quere*, are, first, that there are no Records, or these to be found: secondly, the Books have been several times altered since those Acts: and thirdly, many punished upon the said Acts, because those Books have been generally received and used as established by Law.

4 *Quere*: Whether, notwithstanding the *Royal Licence* before, and *Assent* after; any *Canons* made in *Convocation*, be valid in Law, before they be ratified by Act of Parliament, as the *Service-book*, and *Articles of Religion* were said to be? and, whether, by consequent, the *Canons* of 1603. be now binding? The grounds hereof, are, first, that all other *Constitutions*, are, or are reputed to be, ratified in Parliament. Secondly, the Statute of 1. *Eliz.* 2. which gives power to the *Queen*, *her Heirs and Successours*, to grant Licence to Commissioners, Bishops, and others, to exercise *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*, when it speaks of withdrawing, or altering any *Rites and Ceremonies*; or, adding *new*; the power is there given to the *Queen* alone, without mention of *Heirs and Successours*. And when any thing is ordered, or authorized by the King, although under the Great Seal: yet the enforcing thereof (before ratification by Parliament) is held to be contrary to the *Petition of Right*.

We shall now close up all with this humble Advertisement; that, whereas it is pleaded by some, that *Liturgies* (and, among them, the substance of ours) are ancienter then the *Popish Mass-Books* by many hundreds of years (whence they infer the weakness and folly of their Objections, who say, that all, or most, or any of the things contained in our Service-Book, are taken out of the Mass-Book, and so are Popish, and upon that account would have them abolished:) and, for that purpose, produce some passages out of *Ignatius*, *Clem: Alexandrinus*, *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Chrysostome*, &c. wherein sundry things in use:

use among us, are found mentioned in them; and, by some, the Liturgy of St. *James*, *Peter*, &c. are also urged, although by many Learned men, censured as suppositious. Yet none of these Authors do mention any Publick Form, (the same for substance with ours;) although they speak of Publick Prayers made in the Congregation, which none ever denyed. *Publick Prayer* is one thing; a Publick *Form*, another. Nor are we against all Liturgies, but onely against that which is liable to such material Exceptions as necessitate us to desire a new *Form*. And albeit some of the *Rites and Ceremonies* now in use may be mentioned in sundry of the Fathers within the first 600 years after Christ; yet, the mentioning of them, is no evidence of the lawfulness of them; or, that they are not Popish, (although of latter times, espoused by that Synagogue of *Rome*) for as much as Popery was in the Egge, and *the mystery of iniquity began to work*, (although under disguises, and other names) even in the time of St. *Paul* himself, 2 *Thes.* 2. 7. Yea, some of those very Fathers have sundry passages in them, which condemn those very things which are now cryed up upon the very authority of their venerable names. We shall, for brevity, give but one instance, which every Reader may find in the Preface touching *Ceremonies*, before the Book of Common-Prayer; which, albeit it hath been before alledged, we here briefly touch upon again, for better satisfaction of such as cannot consult the Author himself. The particular mentioned in that Preface, is a passage out of St. *Augustine*; who was so far from approving such a number of *Ceremonies*, (yet, not to be compared with the multitude, in after-times) that he complained that hereby, *Christians were in worse case then were the Jews*, and therefore counselled to take off that *yoke and burden*, so soon as it might quietly be done. And this was one of the Grounds and Reasons there alledged, of the cutting off of so many superstitious Ceremonies, in the first Reformation, under that blessed King, *Edward* the sixth: which, of late, our *Arminians* and *Grotian* Divines and Prelates have sought to recal under the colour and guise of Antiquity: for which they produce onely some bits and scraps of Fathers, to prove their Antiquity; but, no solid Arguments to make out their lawfulness and conveniency; and yet seek to impose them on those who hold themselves bound to *hate the garments spotted with the flesh*, as well as the *flesh*, that is, the *corruption* it self. We therefore conclude, That it is not bare Antiquity, but Divine Verity that must be the onely Rule and Standard of all *Doctrine*, *Worship*, *Rites* and *Ceremonies*, *Ordination*, *Jurisdiction and Discipline*, among all that intend Conformity to the *Mind of Christ*.

FINIS.

Page 1. line 7. read 4 (*Car.* p. 7. l. 1. r. them *in print*) p. 34. l. 18. r. *that*, and *another*. p. 43. l. 26. r. *Presbyteris*. l. 30. r. *qui*.